

# *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*

by Peter Charanis

Available at Internet Archive:  
[The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire](#)

---

This study appears as a volume in the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Armenian Library (Lisbon, 1963). An earlier version was published in the journal *Byzantinoslavica*, volume 22 (1961).

An Armenian translation also is available: [Հայերը Բիզանդական կայսրութեան մէջ Hayere' Biwandakan kaysrut'ean me'j](#), translated by Haig Berberian (Vienna, 1966), *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 199, in 148 pdf pages.

---

[Preface](#), by Sirarpie Der Nersessian.

[Introduction](#).

[I](#), p. 12.

[II](#), p. 28.

[III](#), p. 48.

[IV](#), p. 53.

[Footnotes](#).

[Bibliography](#), pp. 59-63

---

Prepared by Robert Bedrosian, 2010

---

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

# *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*

by Peter Charanis

---

## Preface

[i] In recent years a number of studies on special periods or on individual families, in particular those by the late Nicolas Adontz, have called attention to the role of the Armenians in the Byzantine empire. The present book by Professor Peter Charanis is, however, the first in which this question is considered under its different aspects and over a long period, extending from the reign of Justinian to the disastrous battle of Mantzikert when the Empire lost Armenia and the greater part of Asia Minor. The author has carefully investigated the changes which took place in the ethnic formation of the Empire through the establishment of numerous Armenians, some of whom were transplanted by force and settled in different parts of the Asiatic and European possessions, while others came more or less willingly, fleeing from the Arab domination. He has shown their important contribution to the military might of Byzantium, both as recruits fighting in the ranks of the army, where at times they formed the dominant element, and also as famous generals. From the ninth to the eleventh century, most of those who led the armies to victory and contributed to the greatness of Byzantium were of Armenian stock--emperors such as Basil I, Romanus Lecapenus, Nicephorus Phocas, John Tzimisces and Basil II, or illustrious generals such as Petronas and John Curcuas (or Gourgen).

Professor Charanis has also recalled the prominent role played by the Armenians in the intellectual life of Byzantium during the ninth century, when Caesar Bardas reorganized the University of Constantinople at the palace of the Magnaura and placed at its head his compatriot, Leo the Philosopher, while two of the most famous teachers in it, Photius and John the Grammarian, were partly or wholly of Armenian descent. It is quite probable that Armenians came there as students, just as at a much earlier period, during the fourth century, they had gone to Athens to study under the Armenian rhetor, Prohaeresius, whom Sozomenos calls [ii] the most celebrated sophist of his age, and to whom, according to his pupil and biographer Eunapius, the Romans had erected a statue with the inscription "Rome, the queen of cities, to the king of eloquence."

Some of the leading figures whose origins have been carefully traced by Professor Charanis were recent arrivals from Armenia, others had lived for a long time within the Byzantine realm and were thoroughly hellenized. But the persistence with which, generation after generation, the latter retained their Armenian names clearly indicates that they did not forget their origins, nor perhaps wanted the Byzantines to forget that they descended from ancient and noble families. In fact, it is primarily by means of these names that, in many instances, modern scholars have been able to ascertain a nationality which the Byzantine historians and chroniclers have not always been careful to specify.

The degree of hellenization naturally varied in each case and we have positive evidence that some at least of the men who held high offices continued to use their mother tongue; one of these was the *protospatharios* John who commissioned an Armenian Gospel. The sponsor, about whom we have no other information, calls himself the *proximos* of the *dux* Theodorakanos, who must be the general of Basil II, governor of Philippopolis, known through Byzantine sources. The manuscript, now in the Mekhitharist Library in Venice (no. 887), was written and illustrated in 1007 at Adrianople; this shows not only that the *protospatharios* himself knew Armenian, but that there was in this city a competent Armenian scribe who could carry out the wish of his sponsor.

In speaking of the hellenization of the Armenians who held high offices, Professor Charanis adds: "Yet it may be asked whether their hellenization was not unaffected by their original background, whether in being absorbed they did not modify the culture which absorbed them." A similar question can be raised in connection with certain aspects of [iii] artistic development. Is it mere coincidence that in the decorative arts of Byzantium the oriental elements are predominant during the ninth and tenth centuries, that is, in that very period when men of

Armenian descent were in virtual control of the Empire, and when there was, at the same time, a territorial expansion towards the east and a fresh influx of Armenians? There were no doubt artists and craftsmen among these new arrivals, and they continued to practise their native crafts; thus Armenian carpets are mentioned in the list of spoils carried away by the Bulgarian tsar Krum when the Byzantine armies were defeated and the emperor Nicephorus himself was slain.

In this careful and impartial appraisal of the role of the Armenians in the Byzantine empire, Professor Charanis has laid the foundation for further investigations, and has given us the most important of his many valuable contributions to our knowledge of the Byzantine ethnography.

May, 1963

Sirarpie Der Nersessian

---

# *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*

by Peter Charanis

---

## **Introduction**

The Byzantine Empire was, of course, the continuation of the Roman Empire. The loss of the western provinces and the elimination of the Imperial title in the West in 476 restricted the actual geographical extent of the Roman Empire to the East, including the Balkan peninsula. Here, with the exception of the far interior of the Balkan peninsula, Hellenism had long since come to prevail as the dominant cultural element. But important features of the civilization of the Empire remained basically Roman. This was especially true of its legal system, its administrative machinery, and the organization of the army. A feature also of the Roman Empire which remained as such after the loss of the western provinces was its multinational character. Later, in the seventh century, when the Empire lost some of its eastern provinces, notably Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Armenia, it assumed an aspect more Greek than ever before, but it never really lost to the end of its long history as a great power its multinational character. Its civilization was, of course, basically Greek, and the Greek-speaking element among its population no doubt predominated. But this population included a variety of peoples and some of these peoples were very important.

The following pages are given to an examination of the role in the history of the Empire of one of these peoples: the Armenians. The work was first published in *Byzantinoslavica*, volume 22 (1961). With some revisions, and thanks to the generosity of the Fundacao Calouste Gulbenkian of Lisbon, Portugal, it now appears in book form. The bibliography which is added at the end consists of references actually used in the composition of the work. It was compiled by my student, Dean Miller.

Peter Charanis  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, N. J.

# *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*

by Peter Charanis

---

## I.

[12] In his account of the revolt of Thomas the Slavonian (820--823) against the Emperor Michael II (820--829), the Byzantine historian Genesis lists a variety of peoples from whom the armies of the rebel had been drawn: Saracens, Indians, Egyptians, Assyrians, Medes, Abasgians, Zichs, Vandals, Getae, Alans, Chaldoi, Armenians, adherents of the heretical sects of the Paulicians and the Athinganoi (1). Some of these peoples are well known; the identity of others, despite efforts made to determine it, is by no means certain (2). But in any case, their listing by the Byzantine historian illustrates vividly the multiracial character of the Byzantine empire. This was in the ninth century, but the situation was not different for the period before and it would not be different for the period after. The Byzantine empire was never in its long history, a true national state with an ethnically homogeneous population.

Among the various ethnic groups in the Byzantine empire, the Armenians constituted one of the strongest. At the end of the sixth century the Byzantine empire controlled the major part of Armenia. The events of the seventh century, the rise of the Arabs in particular, deprived it of this control, but it still retained some Armenian-speaking lands. The expansion of the empire which began late in the ninth century greatly increased the extent of these lands. By the middle of the eleventh century, all Armenia was in Byzantine hands, though shortly afterwards it was permanently lost to the Seljuk Turks.

The great source of the Armenian element in the Byzantine empire consisted, of course, of the Armenian-speaking lands under its control. Thus in the eighth century, when all Armenia was in Arab hands, the [13] native Armenian population under the control of the empire was not very large; whereas, in the eleventh century when virtually all Armenia was annexed to the empire it was very considerable. But the Armenian element in the Byzantine empire was not restricted to the Armenian lands proper. It found its way into other regions of the empire.

Many Armenians came into the Byzantine empire even when Armenia was under foreign control. They came sometimes as adventurers, but more often as refugees. Thus in 571, following an unsuccessful revolt against the Persians, numerous Armenian noblemen, headed by Vardan Mamikonian and accompanied by the Armenian Catholicos and some bishops, fled to Constantinople (3). Vardan and his retinue entered the Byzantine army; the rest seem to have settled in Pergamon where an Armenian colony is known to have existed in the seventh century. It was from this colony that Bardanes came who, as Phillipicus, occupied the imperial throne from 711 to 713 (4).

The religious ferment in Armenia which in the seventh century gave rise to the Paulician sect had the effect of bringing more Armenians into the Byzantine empire. Armenian Paulicians, driven from their homes sometime before 662, settled in the empire, especially in the region of the junction of the Iris and the Lycus rivers in the territories of the Pontus. Their settlements extended almost as far as Nicopolis (Enderes) and Neocaesarea (Niksar) (5). These were regions where the Armenian element was already considerable. Comana, for instance, is referred to by Strabo as the market of the Armenians (6).

The discontent caused by the Arab conquest of Armenia forced other Armenians to seek refuge in the territories of the empire. Thus, about 700 a number of *nakharars* [lords] with their retinue fled to the Byzantine empire and were settled by the Emperor on the Pontic frontier. Some of these later returned to Armenia, but others remained (7). More *nakharars*, completely abandoning their possessions in Armenia, fled to the Byzantine empire during the reign of Constantine V Copronymus (8). [14] Still more came about 790. It is said they numbered 12,000 and they came with their wives, their children, their retinue and their cavalry. They were welcomed by the Emperor

and were granted fertile lands upon which to settle (9). We are not told the location of the lands given to them. As their title implies these refugees belonged to the Armenian nobility, who were sometimes criticised for fleeing the country and thus abandoning the poor to the mercy of the Arabs (10). Mass migrations such as took place in the course of the seventh and eighth centuries seem to have subsided in the ninth, but individual Armenians continued to come into the Byzantine empire to seek their fortunes.

The Armenians, however, did not always come willingly. They were sometimes forcibly removed from their homes and settled in other regions of the empire. Justinian had already resorted to this practice, but the numbers involved were small, perhaps a few families (11). Transplantations on a large scale took place during the reigns of Tiberius and Maurice. In 578, 10,000 Armenians were removed from their homes and settled in the island of Cyprus. "Thus", says Evagrius, "land, which had been previously untilled, was everywhere restored to cultivation. Numerous armies also were raised from among them that fought resolutely and courageously against the other nations. At the same time every household was completely furnished with domestics, on account of the easy rate at which slaves were procured" (12).

A transplantation on a vaster plan was conceived by Maurice and it was partially carried out. Maurice, who may have been of Armenian descent, though this is extremely doubtful (13), found the Armenians extremely troublesome in their own homeland. The plan which he conceived called for the cooperation of the Persian king in the removal from their homes of all Armenian chieftains and their followers. According to Sebeos, Maurice addressed the Persian king as follows: The Armenians are "a knavish and indocile nation. They are found between us and are a source of trouble. I am going to gather 'mine and send them to Thrace; [15] send yours to the East. If they die there, it will be so many enemies that will die; if, on the contrary, they kill, it will be so many enemies that they will kill. As for us, we shall live in peace. But if they remain in their country, there will never be any quiet for us". Sebeos further reports that the two rulers agreed to carry out this plan, but apparently the Persians failed to cooperate, for when the Byzantine emperor gave the necessary orders and pressed hard for their execution, many Armenians fled to Persia (14). The Byzantines, however, did carry out the deportation, though only in part. In ordering this removal, Maurice's real motive was, no doubt, the fact that he needed the Armenians as soldiers in Thrace.

Further deportations and settlement of Armenians in the Byzantine empire, especially in Thrace, are attested for the eighth century. During the reign of Constantine V Copronymus, thousands of Armenians and monophysitic Syrians were gathered by the Byzantine armies during their raids in the regions of Germanicea (Marash), Melitene and Erzeroum and were settled in Thrace (15). Others, also from the environs of Erzeroum, were settled along the eastern frontiers. These, however, were subsequently seized by the Arabs and were settled by them in Syria (16). During the reign of Leo IV, a Byzantine raiding expedition into Cilicia and Syria resulted in the seizure of thousands of natives, 150,000 according to one authority, who were settled in Thrace (17). These, however, were chiefly Syrian Jacobites, though some Armenians may have also been included. Many of the Armenians settled in Thrace were seized by the Bulgar Krum (803--814) and carried away, but most of them eventually returned. According to tradition, the parents of the future Emperor Basil I and Basil himself were included among these prisoners, but there is reason to doubt the historical accuracy of this tradition (18).

The diverse ethnic groups established in Thrace were reinforced by later arrivals. In the tenth century, during the reign of John Tzimiskes, a considerable number of Paulicians were removed from the frontier regions of the east and were settled in Thrace, more exactly in the country [16] around Phillippopolis (19). These Paulicians were most probably predominantly Armenians. A little later, perhaps in 988, Armenians were settled also in Macedonia. They were brought there from the eastern provinces of the empire by Basil II in order to serve as a bulwark against the Bulgarians and also to help increase the prosperity of the country (20).

Meanwhile, other Armenians had been settled elsewhere in the empire. Nicephorus I used Armenians, among others, in his resettlement of Sparta at the beginning of the ninth century (21). Some time earlier, about 792, an unsuccessful revolt among the Armeniacs, a corps which was no doubt predominantly Armenian, led to the settlement of a thousand of them in Sicily and other islands (22). In 885 Nicephorus Phocas, grandfather of the tenth century Emperor by the same name, settled a multitude of Armenians in Calabria. These, as Gregoire suggests, may have been of the Paulician faith as Tephrike, the stronghold of that sect, had fallen to the imperial forces only a few years before and the Paulicians had been dispersed (23). Armenians, among others, were also

settled in Crete following the recovery of that island in 961 by Nicephorus Phocas, the future Emperor (24). Two Armenian military settlements are known to have existed in western Asia Minor in the tenth century. These were the settlements at Prine and Platanion, which, according to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, furnished a number of Armenian troops in the expedition against Crete during the reign of Leo VI. Armenians, settled in the Thracian theme, also participated in the expedition against Crete in 949 (25).

It was through the army that the Armenian element in the Byzantine empire exerted its greatest influence. It is well known that the Armenian element occupied a prominent place in the armies of Justinian. Armenian troops fought in Africa, in Italy and along the eastern front. They were also prominent in the palace guard. Procopius mentions by name no less than seventeen Armenian commanders, including, of course, the great Narses (26). But the Armenians were only one among the different ethnic elements which constituted the armies of Justinian. These elements included many barbarians: Erulians, Gepids, Goths, Huns, Lombards, Moors, [17] Sabiri, Slavs and Antae, Vandals; some Persians, Iberians and Tzani and among the provincials, Illyrians, Thracians, Isaurians and Lycaonians (27). Under the immediate successors of Justinian, the ethnic composition of the Byzantine army remained very much the same. "It is said", writes Evagrius, "that Tiberius raised an army of 150,000 among the peoples that dwelt beyond the Alps around the Rhine and among those this side of the Alps, among the Massagetae and other Scythian nations, among those that dwelt in Paeonia and Mysia, and also Illyrians and Isaurians and dispatched them against the Persians" (28). The figure given by Evagrius may perhaps be questioned, but the rest of his statement in its essentials cannot be doubted. It is confirmed by Theophanes, though the figure he gives is much smaller (15,000) (29). And John of Ephesus reports that following the breakdown of negotiations with Persia (575--577), a force of 60,000 Lombards was expected in Byzantium (30). The same author states: "Necessity compelled Tiberius to enlist under his banners a barbarian people from the West called Goths--who were followers of the doctrine of the wicked Arius. They departed for Persia, leaving their wives and children at Constantinople" (31). In Constantinople, the wives of these Goths requested that a church be allocated to them, so that they might worship according to their Arian faith. Thus, it seems quite certain that the ethnic composition of the Byzantine army under Tiberius remained substantially the same as it had been during the reign of Justinian.

The situation changed in the course of the reign of Maurice, chiefly as a result of the Avaro-Slavic incursions into the Balkan peninsula. These incursions virtually eliminated Illyricum as a source of recruits and reduced the possibilities of Thrace. They cut communications with the West and made recruitments there most difficult. The empire, as a consequence, had to turn elsewhere for its troops. It turned to the regions of Caucasus and Armenia. In the armies of Maurice, we still find some Huns (32) and also some Lombards (33). We find Bulgars too (34). But the Armenian is the element which dominates. In this respect Sebeos is once more a precious source. He writes in connection with the war which Maurice undertook against the Avars after 591: Maurice "ordered to gather together all the Armenian cavalry and all the noble *nakharars* skilled in war and adroit in wielding the lance in combat. He ordered also a numerous army to be raised in Armenia, an army composed of soldiers of good will and good [18] stature, organized in regular corps and armed. He ordered that this army should go to Thrace under the command of Musele (Moushegh) Mamikonian and there fight the enemy" (35). This army was actually organized and fought in Thrace. Mamikonian was captured and killed (36), whereupon, the raising of an Armenian force of 2,000 armed cavalry was ordered. This force, too, was sent to Thrace (37). Earlier, during the Persian wars, important Armenian contingents under the command of John Mystacon operated on the eastern front (38). In 602 Maurice issued the following edict: "I need 30,000 cavalrymen by way of tribute raised in Armenia. Thirty thousand families must be gathered and settled in Thrace" (39). Priscus was sent to Armenia to carry out this edict, but before he had time to do so the revolution which overthrew Maurice broke out and the edict apparently was not enforced. It is interesting to observe the correlation of the number of cavalry with the number of families which were to be transplanted to Thrace. Each family was obviously intended to furnish one cavalryman and no doubt each family was going to be given some land. Here we have perhaps an indication that Maurice sought to extend the system of military estates in Thrace (40). But, however that may be, it is quite clear that under Maurice, Armenia became the principal source of recruits for the Byzantine army. The same was true under Heraclius, himself of Armenian descent (41) though that Emperor drew heavily also from among the people of the Caucasus--Lazes, Abasgians, Iberians--as well as on the Khazars (42). All throughout the seventh century indeed the Armenians were one of the most prominent elements in the Byzantine army. And if by the end of the seventh century the conquest of Armenia by the Arabs made it difficult to draw upon that country for

new recruits, Armenians continued nevertheless to occupy an important position in the army of the empire. This was not only because some Armenian-speaking lands remained within the boundaries of the empire, but also because a considerable number of Armenians had been integrated into its new military organization.

The dominant feature of the new military organization of the empire was the theme system, a new provincial organization, the essential element [19] of which consisted of the army corps permanently stationed in each province and commanded by an officer who served at the same time as governor of the province, exercising both military and civil authority. The troops constituting these provincial or thematic corps were often drawn from different ethnic groups and as a consequence their permanent assignment to any one province contributed in altering the ethnic composition of that province. The provinces brought into existence by the new organization were called themes and differed from the old ones not only in the form of their administration but also in extent and configuration. The theme system, whatever its origin, took definite form in the seventh century (43).

Among the themes of Asia Minor the Armeniakon was one of the most important, in rank second only to the Anatolikon. It was a large territory, comprising in whole or in part six former provinces as these provinces are known to have existed in the sixth century. Cappadocia I and part of Cappadocia II; Armenia I and what was still in the hands of the empire of Armenia II; Elenopontos and Pontos Polemoniakos. It was roughly in the form of a triangle whose angles were located on the Black Sea, the one at Sinope, the other at a point not far to the east of Trebizond, and the third a little to the south of Tyana (44). The theme had been organized perhaps as early as before 622 (45) and remained a unit throughout the seventh and eighth centuries. In the course of the ninth century it was parcelled out into a number of smaller themes. By 863 there were four themes in the place of the previous one: the Armeniakon, a new and much smaller circumscription, the Charsianon, Chaldia and Koloneia. The new theme of Sebasteia, created about 912, was also formed out of territory which had formerly belonged to the Armeniakon.

According to an important source of the tenth century, the original Armeniakon theme was so called because of the neighboring Armenians and the Armenians who dwelled in it (46). This is not to be interpreted to mean of course that the population of the theme was everywhere predominantly Armenian. Along the Black Sea, especially in the region of Trebizond, the Greek-speaking element was certainly the most numerous. In the interior, in the region between the Iris and the Halys and in the loop [20] which the latter river forms; i. e., the core of the lands which later came to constitute the small Armeniakon and the Charsianon themes, the old Cappadocian native population, by now deeply hellenized, most probably predominated. There were some Armenians, of course, but they were not in any considerable number. Quite different, however, was the situation in the eastern regions of the theme, the regions which were eventually detached from it to form the themes of Chaldia, Coloneia and Sebasteia. Here the Armenians were very numerous. In Chaldia, along the coastal areas there were many Greeks, of course, but in the interior, in districts such as Keltzine, the Armenian element was very strong. It was strong also in the lands which later formed the themes of Coloneia and Sebasteia. These lands lay in the most part in Little Armenia [Armenia Minor/P'ok'r Hayk'] where the Armenian language, despite the progress made by Hellenism, never ceased to be spoken (47). Important Armenian elements were also to be found in the region of the Iris-Lycus rivers where Neocaesarea, Comana, Gaziura, Amaseia and Eupatoria were located (48). This region was retained in the smaller Armeniakon theme.

The comparatively strong Armenian element in the population of these eastern themes reflected, and was reflected by, the ethnic composition of their military organization. The military corps of the original Armeniakon theme consisted primarily of Armenians (49). Of the various themes into which it was broken predominantly Armenian were the armies of Coloneia and Sebasteia (50), and no doubt also of the smaller Armeniakon. The Armenian element must also have been considerable in the army of Chaldia.

It has been said that the Armenian element must have predominated in the Byzantine army from the ninth century to the Crusades (51). The statistical information necessary for an exact evaluation of this statement does not exist. There are, however, some figures. They go back to about the middle of the ninth century and are given by Arabic sources. They cannot be regarded therefore, as official. These Arabic sources list thirteen themes altogether, two in Europe and eleven in Asia Minor and give figures of the military strength of each. According to one set of figures the total [21] military strength of the thirteen themes mentioned numbered 90,000 (52); according to another set, it numbered 80,000 (53). The combined strength of the Armeniakon, which at this time



still included Coloneia and Sebasteia, Charsianon and Chaldia is given in the first case as 23,000 or over twenty-five percent of the total; in the second case as 18,000 or over twenty-two percent of the total. As these armies, particularly those of the Armeniakon and Chaldia, were predominantly Armenian or of Armenian origin and as there were also Armenians in other thematic corps (54), we have perhaps in one or the other of these percentages, a rough indication of the strength of the Armenian element in the army of the empire about the middle of the ninth century. This strength did not, of course, make the Byzantine armies Armenian, but it did give to the Armenians a considerable influence in the military structure of the empire.

The significance of the Armenian element in the political and military life of the empire may be further seen by the number of persons of Armenian descent who came to occupy influential positions. They served as generals, as members of the imperial retinue, and as governors of provinces (55). Under Heraclius the Armenian Manuel was named *praefectus augustalis* in Egypt. Armenian generals served the same emperor in the field. One of these, Vahan, was actually proclaimed emperor by his troops just before the battle of Yermuk. He later retired to Sinai and became a monk. Armenian princes in Constantinople were very influential. They even plotted to overthrow Heraclius and to place on the throne his illegitimate son, Athalaric. In 641 it was the Armenian Valentinus Arsacidus who enabled Constans II to assume the throne following the death of his father. Valentinus was put in command of the troops in the East, but shortly afterwards, having failed in a plot to seize the throne for himself, he was executed. Other Armenian generals are known to have served under Constans II. Two of these, Sabour, surnamed Aparasitgan, and Theodore were commanders of the Armeniacs, as the troops stationed in the Armeniakon theme were called. After the violent death of Constans II, the Armenian Mizizius (Mjej Gnouni) was proclaimed Emperor and though he was not able to maintain himself, he should be included [22] among the emperors of Armenian descent who occupied the Byzantine throne. Later his son John felt strong enough to rebel against Constantine IV, but he too failed and was destroyed. Many Armenians are known to have been prominent in the service of the Empire in the eighth century also. The Armenian Bardanes occupied the throne from 711 to 713. Artavasdos, son-in-law of Leo III and at one time general of the Armeniacs, also tried for the throne, and for a time was actually master of Constantinople. He was ably assisted by other Armenians: his cousin Teridates, Vahtan the patrician, and another Artavasdos. During the brief period when he held Constantinople, he crowned his son Nicephorus co-emperor and made his other son, Nicetas, general of the Armeniacs. The Armeniacs, the vast majority of whom, as has been said, were Armenians, were Artavasdos' strongest supporters. Other eminent Armenians are known to have served the empire under Constantine V Copronymus. Tadjat Andzevatzik, who came to Byzantium about 750, proved to be a successful commander in the course of Constantine's Bulgarian campaigns. Under Leo IV we find him as general of the Bucellarii. He subsequently fled to the Arabs. Another Armenian, the prince Artavazd Mamikonian, who joined the forces of Byzantium about 771, was general of the Anatolikon under Leo IV. More Armenians are mentioned in connection with the reigns of Constantine VI and Irene. Vardas, one time general of the Armeniacs, was involved in a conspiracy to have Leo IV succeeded by his brother Nicephorus and not by his son Constantine. Another Vardas lost his life in the Bulgarian campaign which Constantine VI conducted in 792. Artaseras or Artashir was another Armenian general active during the reign of Constantine VI. Alexius Musele (Moushegh), Drungarius of the Watch and later general of the Armeniacs, seems even to have aspired to the throne. At least he was accused of entertaining this ambition, and was blinded. His family, as we shall see, achieved great distinction in the ninth and tenth centuries. Another great Byzantine family of Armenian descent, the Skleroi, made its appearance in Byzantium at this time or soon thereafter. Leo Skleros, governor of the Peloponnesus at the beginning of the ninth century, is the first member of this family known to us, but the family was already famous. A number of other persons who occupied important positions during the reigns of Constantine VI, Irene and Nicephorus I may also have been Armenians if one may judge from the Armenian name of Vardanes which they bore. These included: Vardanes, patrician and *domesticus scholarum*; Vardanes, general of the Thracians; Vardanes, called the Turk, general of the Anatolikon, who made an attempt to overthrow Nicephorus I; Vardanes, called Anemas, a *spatharius*. Armenian also was the patrician Arsaber who was *quaestor* under Nicephorus I and who in the unsuccessful plot of 808 to overthrow Nicephorus had been designated the new Emperor.

[23] Illustrious personages of Armenian descent appear frequently also in the annals of the empire in the ninth century. They dominated the imperial throne. Leo V, known as the Armenian, occupied the throne from 813 to 820. He is referred to in one of the sources as *digenes*, 'twyborn', i. e., born of two races, and these two races are

given as Assyrian and Armenian (56). The thorough and careful investigation of all the sources, however, has shown that there is no truth in the tradition (57). Leo was an Armenian who, while still young, had settled in Pidra, an unknown place in the Anatolikon theme, and, like many others of his position, turned to the army for a career and this eventually brought him to the imperial throne. His wife Theodosia, was the daughter of Arsaber (Arschovir), patrician and *quaestor*, no doubt the Armenian Arsaber who, in the unsuccessful plot of 808 to overthrow Nicephorus, had been designated the new Emperor. Thus Leo V sprang from, and headed, an Armenian family, the Armenian nature of which is further illustrated by the Armenian names which its various members bore (58).

Michael II, the man who in 820 overthrew Leo V, was a semi-hellenized native of the region of Amorion, probably of Phrygian descent (59), but the dynasty which he founded eventually became in part Armenian in blood and fell under the domination of the Armenians. Theodora, the wife of Theophilus, son and successor of Michael II, was a native of Ebissa in Paphlagonia, but she was of Armenian descent at least from her father's side (60). Thus Michael III who succeeded his father Theophilus was partly Armenian. His mother's family dominated his reign. During the early years of his reign, while he was still a minor, the imperial office was provisionally in the hands of his mother Theodora who was assisted by a regency composed of members of her family and Theoctistos, the *Logothete* of the Course. To be sure, the members of Theodora's family were soon shoved into the background and for nearly fourteen years Theoctistos, of whose racial origins we have no definite intimation, was Theodora's most powerful minister. But his overthrow and murder in 856 brought to the fore Theodora's brother Bardas, who, until his violent death in 866, was the real ruler of the state. At the same time Petronas, Theodora's other brother, was entrusted with important commands in which he showed [24] considerable ability. His son Marianus was later made prefect of the city by Basil I (61). Important positions were also given to the two sons of Bardas, the younger of whom, Antigonos, was only ten years old, and also his son-in-law, whose name, Symbatius, betrays his Armenian origin (62).

Meanwhile, other members of Theodora's family had been placed in positions of some importance. Her father Marinus had served as *drungarius* and also as *turmarch* (63). Her brother-in-law, Constantine Babutzikos, married to her sister Sophia, bore the title of magister and was at one time Drungarius of the Watch. He was one of the forty-two Byzantine officers who were put to death by the Arabs following their capture of Amorion in 838 (64). Her other brother-in-law Arshavir, married to another of her sisters, Calomaria or Maria, was patrician and magister, titles which put him very high in the society of Byzantium (65). Both Babutzikos and Arshavir were Armenians. Arshavir's two sons, Stephen and Bardas, both became magisters. Bardas married the daughter of Constantine Kontomytes who was governor of Sicily during the reign of Michael III, while Stephen served in the regency at the time of the minority of Constantine VII (66).

Thus, the Armenian family of Theodora at various times occupied important positions and with the elimination of Theoctistos, it came to control the state. And when the overthrow of Bardas and the destruction of Michael III himself, a year later, brought this control to an end, it was another Armenian family that came to the throne. Basil, the man responsible for the elimination of the now partly Armenian Amorion dynasty was, as is well known, of Armenian descent. His progeny, if we discredit the gossip concerning the paternity of his successor, Leo VI, was to rule the Byzantine state for about 190 years. About this dynasty, more will be said below.

Other Armenians, both related and unrelated to the ruling houses, are known to have played important roles in the political and military life of the empire in the ninth century. Leo V, the Armenian, had a nephew, Gregory Pterotos who served him as a general. When Leo was overthrown, Pterotos was exiled by Leo's successor, Michael II, to the island of Scyrus, but he managed to escape and join Thomas in his revolt against Michael II. In the course of the revolt, however, he tried to shift his allegiance to Michael, but before he could act decisively he was [25] attacked, defeated and killed by Thomas (67). More famous was the Armenian Manuel, known as Amalicitas. Protostrator, general of the Armeniacs, Domestic of the Schools, patrician and magister, Manuel served, and served well it would seem, four different emperors, Michael I, Leo V, Michael II and Theophilus, though at one time, during the reign of Michael II, he fled to the Arabs (68). It is this Manuel who is said to have been the uncle of the Empress Theodora, but, as there is some confusion in the sources concerning his career, it may be that Theodora's uncle was another Manuel or even some other person, perhaps the Sergius of Niketia who led an expedition against Crete towards the end of the reign of Michael III (69). Another Armenian,

Constantine, surnamed Maniakes, was Drungarius of the Watch, and later, during the reign of Michael III, Logothete. He was a man apparently conscious of his Armenian descent for he is said to have befriended Basil, the future Emperor, very early in his career because, like himself, Basil was an Armenian. Constantine was the father of Thomas the Patrician who served as Logothete of the Course under the regency during the reign of Constantine VII early in the tenth century. As this Thomas was the father of Genesisius the historian, Constantine was thus the grandfather of the latter (70).

Armenian also in origin was Alexius Musele to whom the Emperor Theophilus gave his daughter Maria in marriage. Alexius, whose family was also known as the Krenitae, was most probably the son of the Alexius Musele who, as has already been pointed out, had held important administrative posts under Constantine VI and Irene. Alexius bore the high ranking titles of patrician, anthypatus, magister and Caesar. As Caesar, he became the heir presumptive to the throne, but the death of his wife and the birth of Michael, who later became Michael III, brought about a certain coolness between him and the Emperor and he retired to a monastery (71). Alexius had a brother, Theodosios, who, judging from the title of patrician which he bore, must also have been an important personage (72). As the brother of Alexius, Theodosios was, of course, also Armenian. Armenian also was Theophilites, the rich courtier and important functionary who is said to have given employment to Basil, the future Emperor, when the latter first arrived in Constantinople, and later introduced him to the imperial court. Theophilites' Armenian descent may be inferred from [26] the fact that he was a relative of Michael III and also of Bardas, the brother of the empress Theodora (73).

The two crimes, the assassination of Caesar Bardas in 866 and that of Michael III in 867, which brought Basil I to the throne, illustrate still further the influential position which the Armenian element had come to have in the imperial court. The instigator of both crimes was, of course, Basil himself, but it was only with the assistance of a number of other important persons that he was able to bring them about. It has been said that all these personages, like Basil himself, were of Armenian descent (74). But if for this view there is no absolute proof, it can be shown readily that the majority of Basil's accomplices were indeed Armenians. Among those involved in the assassination of Caesar Bardas three are definitely known to have been Armenians: Marianos, the brother of Basil; Symbatios, the Logothete of the Course, and son-in-law of the Caesar; and Bardas, the brother of Symbatios. One, John Chaldos, known also as Tziphinaites, may also have been Armenian. The racial antecedents of two, Peter Bulgarus and Constantine Toxaras, cannot be determined with any certainty. Another of the conspirators is called Leo the Assyrian by one source, Asylaeon, cousin of Basil, by another. The same person, a cousin of Basil, and as such an Armenian, is probably meant (75). Marianos, John Chaldos, Constantine Toxaras and Asylaeon were also involved in the assassination of Michael III. As for the rest who took part in that conspiracy, there is some confusion in the sources. One of them, Symbatios, to be distinguished from the son-in-law of Caesar Bardas, who had been mutilated not long after the death of the Caesar, was like Marianos, the brother of Basil. Another, Bardas, identified further as the father of Basil the Rector, a personage about whom nothing else is known, may also have been the brother of Basil; or he may have been the brother or Caesar Bardas' son-in-law, who like the latter had participated in the murder of the Caesar. In either case, he was an Armenian (76). Two others, Jacobitzes and Eulogios, are referred to as Persians. The latter is said to have addressed another of the conspirators, Artavasdos, captain of the Hetaireia, the foreign guard, in Persian. It has been suggested that all three, Jacobitzes, Eulogios and Artavasdos, were really Armenians, natives of those Armenian regions which had once been under the control of Persia, hence, the reference to them as Persians (77). The suggestion is tempting, but, as thousands of [27] Persians had deserted to the empire during the reign of Theophilus (78) it is not improbable that these persons, at least Jacobitzes and Eulogios, were indeed Persians. As for Artavasdos, the probability is that he was an Armenian who also knew Persian. Artavasdos is a name which we find borne by a number of persons who served the empire and who are known to have been Armenians. Marianos, the son of Petronas, may have also been involved in the conspiracy against Michael. He is not mentioned among those who actually committed the crime, but his involvement in it is suggested by the fact that Basil made him prefect of the city soon after the elimination of Michael. Marianos was at least partly Armenian. Thus, while not everyone involved in the crimes against Caesar Bardas and Michael III was Armenian, it was a predominantly Armenian group which put an end to the Amorion dynasty and placed on the throne the Armenian Basil. So influential had the Armenian element become in the imperial court!

The Armenian element was prominent also in the intellectual life of the empire in the ninth century. Intellectual activity in the Byzantine empire had never ceased to exist, but it had subsided considerably in the course of the seventh and eighth centuries and certain educational institutions, such as, for instance, the university which Theodosius II had established in the fifth century, had been allowed to decline. But there was a revival in the ninth century, giving a new impetus to learning which would continue now more or less until the final fall of Constantinople. In this revival a number of persons played an important role. Foremost among these was Photios, the future patriarch and no doubt the most encyclopaedic erudite the Byzantine empire produced. John the Grammarian, patriarch from 837 to 843, was another of these persons. John, who had laid the theological foundations for the renewal of iconoclasm in 815, was reputed among his contemporaries to be well versed in the science of the ancients. He had also taught the emperor Theophilus, who came to look upon the promotion of learning as an important aspect of his reign. The revival of learning culminated in the reestablishment of the University of Constantinople, housed in the palace of Magnaura and for that reason known as the School of Magnaura. Caesar Bardas founded and Leo the Philosopher, whose fame as mathematician and master of the science of antiquity extended as far as Bagdad, headed the school. A number of others, for instance, Constantine the Philosopher, the apostle of the Slavs, are known to have contributed to the intellectual activity of the period, but John the Grammarian, Photios, Caesar Bardas and Leo the Philosopher seem to have been the prime movers. All four were, at least in part, of Armenian descent. Bardas's Armenian origin has already been pointed out; that of Leo can be inferred from the fact that he was a cousin of John the Grammarian of whose [28] Armenian origins there can be little doubt (79), and as for Photios, the fact is that his mother, Irene, was the sister of Arshavir, the Arshavir who had married Calomaria, the sister of Bardas and the empress Theodora (80). These people appear, of course, thoroughly hellenized. Indeed it would be preposterous to call Photios anything but a Greek. Yet it may be asked whether their hellenization was not unaffected by their original background, whether in being absorbed they did not modify the culture which absorbed them.

# *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*

by Peter Charanis

---

## II.

The number of Armenians subject to the Byzantine empire increased considerably in the period following the accession of Basil I [866-886] to the throne. This was the result of two developments: the territorial expansion of the empire eastward and a movement westward by Armenians. The liquidation of the military resistance of the Paulicians effected finally in 872 by the destructions of Tephrike and the annihilation of the forces of Chrysochier, the Paulician chieftain, brought about the first important annexation. The Paulicians were a religious sect which must have included elements of diverse ethnic origins, but the Paulician strongholds which were now incorporated in the empire, were no doubt predominantly Armenian. To be sure, the surviving Paulicians were dispersed or entered the military organization of the empire to serve elsewhere, but the lands which they had been forced to abandon were soon to be occupied, under the aegis of the empire, by other Armenians. Besides, not all of the original inhabitants were removed. The inhabitants of the stronghold of Taranta, the modern Derende, which came to terms with the empire, certainly stayed and [29] probably also some of those of Locana (81). Taranta is referred to as an Islamic city, but given its location in Paulician territory it must have also included Armenians among its inhabitants. As for Locana, it was no doubt inhabited predominantly by Armenians, for its chieftain was the Armenian Kourtikios (Kourterios) who now, together with his followers, entered the services of the empire.

Some years later, during the reign of Leo VI (886--912) additional Armenian territory was annexed, when the Armenian chieftain Manuel was induced to cede his lands, the region known as Tekis, to the empire. Located between the Euphrates and the Chimishgezek-su and bounded on the south by the Arsanas, Tekis was inhabited entirely by Armenians. Manuel, accompanied by his four sons, moved to Constantinople where he was showered with honors; two of his sons were vested with important commands, while the other two were given new holdings in the neighborhood of Trebizond (82). His former possessions, augmented by the addition of two districts, Kelzene and Kamacha, the one taken from the theme of Chaldia, the other from that of Coloneia, and both Armenian speaking, were organized, sometime between 899 and 912, into the theme of Mesopotamia (83). The new theme was entirely Armenian.

In the meantime, a considerable Armenian element moved westward and settled in the territory formed by the regions along the upper Tocha-su where the so-called desert of Symposion seems to have been located; the territory north of Arabisos where several bodies of water join to form the Pyramos river (Gaihan-su) and where the old fortress of Lycandos was most probably located; and the territory finally along the upper Karmalas river (Zamanti-sii) where at a high point near the river, not far from Azizie, the Ariarathia of the Greeks, on the road which went from Caesarea to Gurun and thence to Melitene, the fortress of Tzamandos was built (84). The initiative in this settlement was taken by several Armenian chieftains, [30] chief among whom, and no doubt the ablest and most aggressive, was a certain Mleh, the Melias of the Byzantine sources.

Melias had entered the military service of the empire and had fought against the Bulgarians in the battle of Bulgarophyon in 896, but subsequently fell in disfavor and fled to the Arabs in Melitene. Some years later, Melias and four other Armenian chieftains, three of them brothers, who were with him in Melitene, were granted permission to return to the empire and were put in command of certain frontier districts, located in the territories referred to above. But as the four other Armenian chieftains soon passed from view--one was killed fighting the Arabs, another was exiled and nothing more is said of the two brothers of the latter--it was really Melias who reclaimed the country, whose grassy valleys, so favorable for the raising of cattle, are especially noted, and settled it with Armenians. It was he also who rebuilt the old fortress of Lycandos and founded the new one of Tzamandos. He was given the title of patrician, then that of magister and when about 914 the regions which he

reclaimed were erected into a theme, the theme of Lycandos, he was made its first strategos or governor. Throughout the period after his return from Melitene, Melias served the empire loyally and well. His Armenian following never ceased to increase. By the time he died in 934 the theme of Lycandos, to use the words of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, was full of Armenians (85).

The number of Armenians within the empire increased still more as a result of the Byzantine offensive along the eastern frontier, which began about 927. The most decisive event of this offensive in the annexation of new territory was the capture of Melitene in 934. Melitene was not Armenian country, though, at the time of its capture, some Armenians may have lived there. It was not long, however, before Melitene became an Armenian town (86).

The capture of Melitene opened the way for the annexation of several territories across the Euphrates. As some of these territories belonged to the emir of Melitene, their occupation by Byzantium must have taken place shortly after the capture of that city. But no precise dates can be given. Included among these territories were: the country of Khanzit located south of the Arsanas in the loop formed by that river and the Euphrates and extending eastward in a southerly direction as far as the regions beyond [31] Lake Gulgik (Buhairat Sumnin) where, near the point where the Arghana-su, one of the sources of the Tigris, breaks through the Taurus, the fortress of Romanopolis was built; the city of Arsamosata (Asmosata, Shimshat), located on the southern banks of the Arsanas further east, and its surroundings; and the country north of the Arsanas and east of the Chimishgezek-su. The Khanzit with Romanopolis was added to the theme of Mesopotamia (87), but Arsamosata and the region east of the Chimishgezek-su were organized into new themes known respectively as the Asmosaton (88) and Charpezikion themes, though the latter gave way shortly after 949 to the new theme of Chozanon which seems to have been established about this time and included the same general area (89). The year 949 saw also an important new annexation. This was Theodosiopolis (Erzerum, Qaliqala) which was made the center of a new theme consisting of the country about the source waters of the Euphrates and the Araxes (90). All these territories were Armenian speaking.

To these territories was added in 966 the country of Taron, situated in the regions where the Arsanas is joined by its tributary, the Qara-su, which rises in the mountains of Nimrud to the west of Lake Van. Its capital was the city of Mush. The country was ceded, no doubt under pressure, to Byzantium in exchange for other lands located elsewhere in the empire by the Armenian brothers Gregory and Pancratios (Bagrat) who had inherited it from their father. The Byzantines probably did not consolidate their position until 975 (91). Taron was, of course, Armenian country. Meanwhile the westward expansion of the Armenians continued. "During the patriarchate of Khatchik, patriarch of Armenia", writes the [32] Armenian historian Asoghik, "the Armenian nation scattered and spread itself to the countries of the west to such an extent that he appointed bishops for Antioch of Syria, Tarsus of Cilicia, Soulndah (Lulnday) and for all these regions" (92). Soulndah is the fortress of Lulon situated south of Tyana and commanding the road which went through the Cilician Gates (93). It was annexed definitely by the Byzantines in 876--77.

Khatchik was the Armenian Catholicos from 972--992 (94), but the scattering and spreading of the Armenians for whom he saw fit to establish new bishoprics began somewhat earlier, a fact which can be established on the basis of other oriental sources. One of these sources, for instance, while describing the successful campaigns of Nicephorus Phocas against the Arabs, remarks that many Armenians, having fled to the frontiers of Byzantium, were settled by the Byzantines, some in Sebasteia of Cappadocia where they "multiplied exceedingly", others in the fortresses of Cilicia which had been captured from the Arabs (95). This movement of the Armenians was no doubt encouraged, perhaps even forced, by the imperial authorities in order to repeople the various towns captured from the Arabs as, for instance, Melitene; Tarsus, captured in 965; Antioch, captured in 969 and others, which suffered considerable losses in population as the result of the departure of most of the Moslems. It is known, for instance, that Armenians and Syrian Jacobites were used by Nicephorus Phocas to repeople Melitene which had become virtually deserted (96). The spread of the Armenians into Byzantine territory in the tenth century was not restricted to the newly conquered Cilician and Syrian lands but extended, as the mention of Sebasteia in the reference quoted above indicates, into older provinces including the Cappadocian regions around Caesarea and Nazianzus where the existence of Armenian settlements in the tenth century has been confirmed by the investigation of modern scholars (97).

A later oriental source in describing the spread of the Armenians into the Byzantine empire in the tenth century adds that in all the wars waged by the Romans "the foot soldiers of the Armenians marched and they aided them greatly" (98). There is nothing in this statement indicating the relative numerical strength of the Armenian element in the Byzantine army, but the statement does attribute to this element a role of major importance. The Byzantine army in the tenth century as in all other centuries to the [33] very end of the empire was composed of different peoples. The army of 50,000 men, for instance, which Bardas Phocas, the father of Nicephorus, the future emperor, led against Saif al-Daula in 954, consisted, we are told, of Armenians, Turks, Russians, Bulgars, Slavs and Khazars". To these we may add Georgians (100), converted Saracens (101) and other peoples, who fought on other occasions and whose numbers were by no means insignificant. Nevertheless, as one examines the various campaigns of the Byzantine forces in the tenth century, one is struck by the ever presence of the Armenian element. Armenians participated in every major campaign. They constituted about one-third of the cavalry sent against Crete in the ill-fated expeditions of 911 and 949, and figured prominently among the forces of Nicephorus Phocas which succeeded in conquering the island in 960 (102). They are found fighting in Italy under the elder Nicephorus, grandfather of the conqueror of Crete, during the reign of Basil I, and again in 934 under the patrician Cosmas (103). They fought in the Balkan peninsula as, for instance, in 971 when they contributed greatly to the victory of John Tzimiskes against the Russians and again in 986 when they served under Basil II against the Bulgars (104).

It was in the campaigns against the Arabs along the eastern frontiers, however, that the Armenian contingents in the Byzantine forces stand out most prominently. Their role can hardly be overestimated in the armies of John Curcuas whose appointment as generalissimo (Domestic of the Schools) of the Byzantine forces in the East in 923 may be said to mark the beginning of the brilliant general offensive against the Arabs. Melias and his Armenian followers were, for instance, a major factor in the capture of Melitene and the surrounding country in 934 (105). In the multinational army of 50,000 men which Bardas Phocas put in the field in 954 the Armenian contingents were among the most important. They are said to have suffered the greatest losses in the disaster which followed (106). The Armenians are much in evidence too in the Cilician and [34] Syrian campaigns of Nicephorus Phocas (107), and they constituted the principal backers of Bardas Skleros when in 976 he rebelled against Basil II (108). While it would be going too far to refer to the rebellion of Skleros as an Armenian national movement, there is no question at all about the Armenian composition of his forces. This prominence of the Armenian element in the forces of Byzantium along the eastern frontiers was no doubt the basis of the observation of the modern scholar which we have tried to analyze above that the Armenian (i. e., of Armenian origin) and the Armenian-speaking element must have been predominant in the Byzantine army from the ninth century to the Crusades. Predominant indeed it was if by predominant we mean it was more important than any other national group that served in the Byzantine army.

There is evidence in the sources to the effect that the Armenians serving in the Byzantine army did not constitute a disciplined lot. They could not be relied on to keep their posts: they often deserted; and they did not always obey orders (109). As these accusations come to some extent from official sources, they cannot be dismissed entirely. But lack of discipline often is associated with spiritedness and of the spiritedness, bravery and fighting qualities of the Armenian soldiers serving in the Byzantine army, there can be no question at all. There can be no question either about the great contribution which these soldiers made to the brilliant successes of this army in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

The role of the Armenians in the political and military life of the Byzantine empire, in the late ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries appears still more impressive when one examines the leadership which guided the empire during this period. For virtually every major figure in that leadership was of Armenian origin.

First of all, there is the dynasty, the most brilliant in the history of the empire. The imperial house which ruled the state throughout this period is known as the Macedonian dynasty, but the term Macedonian as used here has no ethnic connotations. It refers rather to the place of the birth of Basil I, the founder of the dynasty. Basil was an Armenian, born in Macedonia where numerous Armenians had been settled. To be sure, there are references found in Arabic sources which raise the question whether Basil may not have been a Slav. In some of these references he is called simply a Slav without any further explanations; in others he is called [35] a Slav because his mother was a Slav (110). Some modern scholars have taken these references seriously and as a consequence

have given to Basil a Slavic or Armeno-Slavic origin (111). But in view of the Byzantine and Armenian traditions both of which insist on the Armenian origin of Basil, their opinion is more than questionable. As for the Arabic references, they can best be explained as the result of a confusion arising from the fact that Basil's birthplace was Macedonia whose inhabitants were regarded by the Arabs as Slavs. That Basil I, the founder of the most brilliant dynasty of the Byzantine empire, was indeed Armenian and Armenian on both sides, can be regarded as an established fact (112).

Thus, the dynasty which Basil I founded was Armenian by descent. There was some gossip recorded and passed on by the chronicles that Basil's successor, Leo VI, was actually sired by Michael III and as a consequence was not Basil's genuine son. The careful study of this gossip has shown that it has no basis in fact (113), but even if it were true that Michael III was indeed the father of Basil's successor, that would still make Leo at least partly Armenian for, as the reader will recall, Michael's mother was the Armenian Theodora.

The Armenian element in the Macedonian dynasty was strengthened by the marriage of Constantine Porphyrogenitus to Helen, the daughter of Romanus Lecapenus. Thus Basil II, no doubt the ablest military leader that the Macedonian dynasty produced, had as a grandmother an Armenian lady and as a grandfather an emperor who was himself the grandson of the Armenian founder of the dynasty. The dynasty was, of course, hellenized--Byzantinized is perhaps a more appropriate term -- but the form which this hellenization took was no doubt influenced by its Armenian antecedents, though the extent of this influence is a matter which the historian cannot really determine.

Three of the ablest emperors of the tenth century were not legitimate members of the Macedonian dynasty, but they were associated with it and respected the rights of its members to the throne, though in the case of one, he would have liked, and indeed tried to have his family prevail. Two of these Emperors, Romanus Lecapenus (919--944) and John Tzimiskes (969--976) are definitely known to have been of Armenian origins.

[36] Romanus Lecapenus is said by the chroniclers to have been born in the Armeniac theme (114), but a modern scholar places his birth at Lakape (Laqabin), a place south of Melitene; hence his name Lecapenus (115). He was of obscure origin and of limited, if any, formal education. His father was a certain Theophylact, called Abastactus, who, as a simple soldier, once saved Basil I from being captured by the Saracens (116). But the favor which was shown to him as a consequence of this feat apparently did not make him wealthy. In any case, the son is said to have been poor when he came to Constantinople and entered the naval services of the empire. But he was able and a good judge of men and so rose in rank until he became governor of the naval theme of Samos and then Grand Admiral (Drungarius) of the Fleet. The latter position enabled him to prevail in the struggle for power which took place during the minority of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the son of Leo VI. In December 919 he was crowned Emperor to rule with young Constantine. Meanwhile, his daughter Helen was married to the young Emperor. Thus did this rustic Armenian become emperor and his daughter the wife of an emperor, himself the grandson of another Armenian. But this was not all. Romanus had four sons, three of them, Christopher, Stephen and Constantine, he raised to the throne to be his associates; the fourth, Theophylact, he eventually made patriarch. Thus, church and state fell completely into the hands of the son and grandsons of the simple Armenian soldier who had served under Basil I and whose granddaughter besides was married to the only surviving descendant of that Emperor. Though the son and grandsons of this Armenian eventually fell from power, his granddaughter, as the wife of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, remained Empress and gave to the empire its next Emperor, the man who sired the great Basil II (117).

Quite different was the background of John Tzimiskes. He is said to have been born in the Armenian district of Khozan in a place called after him, Chemshkacagh (118). John Curcuas, the commander (Domestic) of the *Hikanatoi* who served under and plotted against Basil I (119), was Tzimiskes' direct ancestor. The name of Tzimiskes' father is not known, but his [37] grandfather was Theophilos, an able provincial governor and military commander who distinguished himself in the wars against the Arabs during the reign of Romanus Lecapenus. Theophilos' brother was no other than the Armenian John Curcuas, the brilliant generalissimo (Domestic of the Schools) of the Byzantine forces in the East during the same period. Thus, Tzimiskes, one of the truly great soldier-emperors of Byzantium, belonged by birth to a distinguished Armenian family which had established itself among the military aristocracy of Byzantium. And through marriage he was related to other great families. His first wife Maria, who died before he became Emperor, was the daughter of Bardas Skleros, a



member of an illustrious family of Armenian descent (120). Through his mother he was related to the Phocades, one of the most powerful Byzantine families in the tenth century (121). His second wife was Theodora, the daughter of Constantine Porphyrogenitus and the Armenian Helen (122). It was his marriage to Theodora that gave to his occupation of the imperial throne an air of legitimacy. He had come to the throne through murder, a murder for which he was not innocent, but he added greatly to its lustre and preserved it for the grandsons of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the great Basil II and his much less capable brother, Constantine VIII.

The third Emperor of the tenth century who was not a legitimate member of the Macedonian dynasty but was associated with it was Nicephorus Phocas (963--969), another of the truly great soldier-emperors of the empire. Phocas belonged to one of the most distinguished Byzantine families of the tenth century. Of the beginnings of this family nothing is known. The name Phocas appears as early as the fifth century; it is also attested for the sixth century; and there is of course, the Emperor Phocas, apparently of Cappadocian origin, who overthrew Maurice and was in turn overthrown by Heraclius early in the seventh century (123). But there is no evidence connecting the great tenth century family with any of these early Phocades. To be sure there was a tradition in Byzantium that the Phocades of the tenth century were an old family, and this tradition, apparently sponsored by the family, connected them with the descendants of the great house of the Fabii, who, it was said, had originally been brought to Constantinople, along with other distinguished families, by Constantine the Great (124). But no evidence corroborating this tradition exists. The fact of the matter is that the first known member of this family does not go further back than the second half of the ninth century.

[38] This was a certain Phocas, Cappadocian, i. e., born in Cappadocia, by origin, who became noted for his strength and courage and whom Basil I appointed *tourmarch* (125). Phocas had a son, Nicephorus by name, who as a young man attracted the attention of Basil I and so became a member of that Emperor's immediate entourage. This was the beginning of a brilliant career which extended well into the reign of Leo VI and in the course of which Nicephorus distinguished himself as provincial governor and general commander in the field (126). His two sons Bardas and Leo followed in his footsteps. Leo, in his bid for the throne during the minority of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, lost out to Romanus Lecapenus (127), but Bardas continued to serve the empire for many years. He was the father of the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas (128).

Thus the Phocades were by origin natives of Cappadocia where their possessions were also located. In Cappadocia in the ninth century the Greek-speaking element no doubt predominated (129), a fact which, when taken in conjunction with the Greek name of the family, suggests a Greek origin for the Phocades. But this is not the view that has come to prevail. In the opinion of Adontz who is followed by Grégoire, the Phocades, like many other great families of Asia Minor in the tenth century, were Armenians. Their argument, based really on the fact that the Armenian name of Bardas was used by virtually every generation of the family, has something to recommend it. For in Byzantium where the tendency was definitely toward hellenization and changes in name assumed Greek forms, the retention of a non-Greek name should only mean that the person who bore it was, if not entirely, at least in part of non-Greek origins.

Now, among the Phocades there are two given names which appear frequently and with a remarkable regularity: Nicephorus and Bardas, the first Greek, the second Armenian. Thus Nicephorus Phocas, the famous general who served under Basil I and Leo VI, named one of his sons Bardas, the other Leo. Bardas in turn named his sons, one Nicephorus, the future Emperor, the other Leo. The Emperor Nicephorus had a son who died before his father became Emperor, whose name was Bardas (130). Had the boy grown to manhood and sired a son, he would have named him, no doubt, Nicephorus. The brother of the Emperor Nicephorus, Leo, had a numerous family. One of his sons was named Nicephorus, another Bardas, the famous Bardas Phocas who rebelled against Basil II. This Bardas Phocas had a son Nicephorus who in turn named his son Bardas (131). [39] When we next hear of the Phocades, it is in connection with the Emperor Botaneiates (1078--1081) who claimed descent from the Phocades and whose given name was Nicephorus (132).

It is quite obvious that in their use of the names of Bardas and Nicephorus the Phocades followed a pattern which consisted in this: that grandfather and grandson usually bore the same name. And if we may judge from this pattern the first Phocas, the man who was named *tourmarch* by Basil I, whose given name is not known, most probably was called Bardas, his father, judging from the name of his son, probably Nicephorus.

The frequency and regularity with which these names were used among the Phocades represents quite obviously, an important family tradition. And this tradition is perhaps not unrelated to the ethnic origin of the family. The Phocades of the tenth century were most probably of mixed origin. One side of them was Greek or deeply hellenized, the other side was Armenian. Which side was Greek and which side was Armenian is, of course, impossible to say with any degree of certainty, but judging from the name of the family, the Greek side was probably the male one. Some Nicephorus Phocas, perhaps the father of the Phocas who was named turmarch by Basil I, married into an Armenian family whose head was a Bardas and so founded the great family of the tenth century.

This view, based entirely on the names used by the family, finds some corroboration in the tradition concerning the origin of the family to which reference has already been made. According to this tradition the Phocades, it will be recalled, descended from the Fabii whom Constantine the Great had brought to Constantinople. But that was only one side; the other side was Iberian in origin, going back to the Iberians whom Constantine, we are told, had brought from the west and settled in the country once inhabited by the Assyrians, then by the Medes and afterwards by the Armenians (133). Is this a cryptic allusion to the Armenian origin of one side at least of the Phocades? It may be so interpreted especially since the Armenian name of Bardas was so frequently and with such a regularity used by them.

The Phocades then, if not entirely Armenian in origin were at least partially so. That means, of course, that Nicephorus Phocas, one of the three emperors of the tenth century who were not legitimate members of the Macedonian dynasty, but were associated with it, was also at least partially Armenian in origin.

Thus, every emperor who sat on the Byzantine throne from the accession of Basil I to the death of Basil II (867-1025) was of Armenian or partially Armenian origin. But besides the emperors there were many [40] others among the military and political leaders of Byzantium during this period who were Armenians or of Armenian descent. Included among these were some of the ablest military commanders and administrative functionaries in the history of Byzantium. Some of these commanders and officials belonged to families of Armenian origin long established in the empire; others were new arrivals; while still others, though appearing for the first time, may have had established antecedents about which nothing is known.

No doubt the ablest Byzantine commander in the field during the first half of the tenth century was the Armenian John Curcuas. Curcuas belonged to a well-to-do family established in the empire for some time. He was related to a metropolitan of Gangra, Chistopher by name, who is said to have directed his early education. His grandfather, named also John, was the Curcuas wrho, as commander (Domestic) of the Hikanatoi served under, and plotted against, Basil I (134). The younger John Curcuas came into prominence with the rise to powrer of Romanus Lecapenus. Appointed generalissimo (Domestic of the Schools) of the Byzantine forces in the East in 923, Curcuas served in that capacity for more than twenty-two years in the course of which he was almost continuously engaged against the Arabs and almost always with striking success (135). Almost as able and equally accomplished was his brother Theophilos, who, as it has already been observed, was the grandfather of the Emperor John Tzimiskes. John Curcuas was removed from his command in 944 and was replaced by the patrician Pantherios, who, as a relative of Romanus Lecapenus, was probably also of Armenian origin (136). Descendants of John Curcuas were prominent in the political and military life of the empire throughout the rest of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century (137).

Romanus Lecapenus turned also to a member of a family of Armenian origin long established in the empire for his chief naval commander. This was the patrician Alexius Mushele whose family was already prominent at the beginning of the ninth century. Alexius was named Admiral (Drungarius) of the fleet and as such, participated in the wars against the Bulgarian Symeon in which he lost his life (138). Meanwhile Romanus had married one of his daughters to a member of the Mushele family, perhaps to Alexius himself, thus strengthening the Armenian element in the family. Born of this union was the magister Romanus Mushele who served [41] as governor of the Opsikian theme during the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus following the overthrow of the Lecapeni and whose possessions in the region of Philomelion were so vast that Basil II saw fit to seize them (139). Basil's act apparently impoverished the family. To the Mushele family belonged also perhaps the Armenian Alexius who served as governor of Cyprus during the reign of Basil I (140). Alexius was the favorite name in this family.

The Mushele family is also referred to as that of the Krenitae. The name Krenites is used for the first time in connection with the Alexius Mushele who, as has already been observed, was married to Maria, the daughter of the Emperor Theophilus. But the name was apparently older, for we are told that Alexius occupied the houses of Krenitissa, *i. e.*, the houses of the lady of the family of Krenites. Whether the Krenitae were identical with the main Mushele family or were a branch of it is not quite clear. In any case, they were of Armenian origin. A number of them are known to have occupied important positions. These include: George, Procopius, Arotas, Arotas' son Abessalom, and Paschal. George served under Leo VI and was charged by him to pursue Samonas (141) when the latter escaped. Procopius commanded the Byzantine troops sent against the Bulgarian Symeon in 894; he was defeated and killed. Arotas, a protospatharius, served as governor of the Peloponnesus and of Hellas during the reign of Romanus Lecapenus; Abessalom was implicated in the unsuccessful attempt in 913 of Constantine Ducas to seize the throne; he was blinded and exiled. Paschal served as the Byzantine governor of Longobardia during the reign of Romanus Lecapenus. Paschal also, as imperial ambassador to Hugh of Provence, negotiated the marriage between Hugh's daughter and the young son of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. There is another Krenites, referred to simply as protospatharius, who was used by Romanus Lecapenus as interpreter in his negotiations with the Armenian princes of Taron. Who this Krenites was is impossible to say, but the information about him that he was an interpreter in negotiations with Armenian princes is interesting, for it shows, as Adontz has remarked, that the Krenitae, though long established in the empire, still spoke Armenian. The family seems to have retained its prominence past the middle of the eleventh century (142).

[42] The Skleroi, whose first known member, as had already been pointed out, was governor of the Peloponnesus at the beginning of the ninth century, was another established Armenian family of major importance in the political and military life of the empire in the tenth century. The patrician Nicetas Skleros served under Leo VI and was entrusted with the task of inciting the Hungarians against the Bulgarian Symeon, a task which he successfully carried out (143). No doubt the most famous member of the family was Bardas Skleros. As generalissimo of the Byzantine forces in the east during the reign of Tzimiskes (144), Bardas distinguished himself in the field, but he is better known for his revolt against Basil II, a revolt in which, as has already been pointed out, his forces were predominantly Armenian, and which almost brought him on the throne (145). The Skleroi were related by marriage to other powerful families. Bardas' sister Maria was married to John Tzimiskes; his brother Constantine, to a Phocas, niece of the emperor Nicephorus, and sister of Bardas Phocas, Skleros' antagonist (146); and his own grandson Basil, to a member of the Argyri, Pulcheria, the sister of Romanus, who later became emperor (147). The Skleroi were politically influential throughout the eleventh century. A Skleros was involved in the revolt of the military which put Issac Comnenus on the throne in 1057 (148); another took part in the conspiracy of the Anemas family against Alexius Comnenus (149).

Reference has already been made to the magister Stephen, the son of Calomaria and the Armenian Arshavir, who served as a member of the regency appointed to guide the state during the minority of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (150). But more important in the central administration of the empire were two other personages of Armenian or partially Armenian descent. One was Stylianos Zaoutzes, the other was Basil the *paracoemomenos*. Zaoutzes was an Armenian born in Macedonia whom we first find in the entourage of Basil I. He was apparently one of Basil's most trusted courtiers for just before he died he committed to Zaoutzes "the direction of all matters, ecclesiastical and political". Under Leo VI he became the most powerful imperial minister, directing indeed "all matters, [43] ecclesiastical and political" (151). The title of *basileopator*, 'father of the emperor', was expressly created for him even before his daughter Zoe, who was the mistress of Leo VI, became Leo's wife (152). His death early in 896 was followed not long afterwards by that of this daughter. His family, threatened now with loss of power, plotted against the government but their plot was discovered and they were destroyed (153). It was this plot of the family of Zaoutzes that first brought into prominence the Saracen Samonas, one of the most remarkable personages in the intelligence service of the imperial government.

Basil the *paracoemomenos* was the illegitimate son of the emperor Romanus Lecapenus who, as the reader already knows, was an Armenian. His mother was a Slav (154). Introduced into the government during the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus Basil became, beginning with the reign of Nicephorus Phocas, the real director of the civil administration of the empire. He was particularly effective during the early years of the reign of Basil II when his intelligence and cunning enabled the young emperor to weather the various storms which threatened

him with destruction. Basil was indeed very greedy, but he was not only an able administrator, but also a statesman (155).

A number of personages, active during the late ninth and early part of the tenth century may have also been of Armenian origins. Included among these was Leo, surnamed Apostyppes, who, as governor of Macedonia, was sent in command of his troops to fight against the Saracens in Italy in 880. The failure of the campaign resulted in his disgrace and exile. It is on the basis of the names of his sons, Bardas and David, that one may suppose that he was Armenian (156). Another, this one certainly an Armenian, was Adrian the patrician. Adrian must have been a person of some importance, for Romanus Lecapenus married his son Constantine to his daughter (157). Still another was Gregoras Iberitzes, who was Domestic of the Schools in 906--907. Iberitzes was the father-in-law of Constantine Ducas and was implicated in the revolt attempted by the latter in 913 to seize control of the government (158). Implicated in the same revolt was another personage, Constantine Lips, who, judging from the name of his son Bardas, was probably also an Armenian. This Bardas, a patrician, was [44] involved in the plot to overthrow Romanus II in 961. Lips had another son, named also Constantine, who bore the title of anthypatos and patrician and was the great Hetaeriarch during the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (159). Kourtikes, known definitely to have been an Armenian and about whom more will be said below was also a partisan of Ducas (160). Indeed among the known partisans of Constantine Ducas there are so many who seem to have been Armenian that one may raise the question whether that powerful Byzantine family may not have been of Armenian origin (161).

Among the Armenians who entered the services of the empire toward the end of the ninth century and established a place for themselves and their families, the most famous no doubt was Mleh, the Melias of the Byzantines. Of this Melias and his activities along the eastern frontier reference has already been made. Melias was indeed a great figure whose deeds were later attributed to Digenes Akrites, the hero of the Byzantine epic in which, as Melimentzes, Melias himself appears as one of Digenes' opponents. Melias died in 934, but he apparently left a son who also distinguished himself in the service of the empire, first as provincial governor and finally, under John Tzimiskes, as Domestic of the Schools. He died before Amida in 973. It is this Melias who is represented in a fresco in one of the churches in Cappadocia not far from Caesarea, where he is referred to as magister (162). What happened to the family after 973 is not known; but it is interesting to observe that there were still at the beginning of the twentieth century heterodox tribes in the region of Adana and Tarsus which bore the name of Melemenjii (163).

Reference has also been made to another Armenian who entered the services of the empire in the last quarter of the ninth century. This was Kourtikios, called more often Kourtikes, who it will be recalled, was the chieftain of the fortress of Locana which he turned over to the empire following the destruction of Tephrike in 872 and, together with his Armenian followers, entered the services of the empire. It was this Kourtikes, no doubt, who as one of the commanders of the Byzantine troops sent against the Bulgarian Symeon in 894 lost his life (164). But he had already established his family in the political and military life of the empire. For a Kourtikes, probably the son of the chieftain of Locana, was, as has already been observed, a partisan of Constantine Ducas and died in his [45] attempt to seize power in 913 (165). A Manuel Kourtikes helped to dethrone Romanus Lecapenus in 944 and was later made patrician and Drimgarius of the Watch by Constantine Porphyrogenitus (166). Some years later a Michael Kourtikes was a naval commander and sided with Bardas Skleros in his revolt against Basil II (167). Thus, throughout the tenth century the Kourtikes family played a role of some importance in the political and military life of the empire. This role continued into the eleventh century.

A high water mark of the Byzantine offensive on the eastern front in the second half of the tenth century was the capture of Antioch in 969. The commander of the Byzantine troops which took this famous Syrian city was Michael Bourtzes (168). Bourtzes was an Armenian. In 976 he was named Duke of Antioch, but soon after joined the rebellious forces of Bardas Skleros, bringing along with him a contingent of Armenians. But by 992 we find him Duke of Antioch again. Meanwhile he had established his family in the political and military life of the empire. His elder son was already, as early as 976, active as military commander. The Bourtzes family remained prominent in the political and military life of the empire throughout the eleventh century. They seem to have been particularly active during the reign of Alexius Comnenus (169).

Another Armenian family active in the military life of the empire in the late tenth and eleventh century, was that of Theodorokanos. The first known member of this family was the patrician Theodorokanos who served as general in the Bulgarian wars of Basil II. When he retired from active life in 1000--1001 because of old age, he was governor of Philippopolis. The last known member of the family, probably the grandson of the patrician Theodorokanos, was Constantine who died shortly after 1077. He had opposed Nicephorus Bryennios in his attempt to become emperor, was captured by him and was sent into exile where he died. The other two members of the family known, George and Basil, were no doubt sons of the patrician. They both held important commands (170).

The Dalassenoi, one of the more prominent Byzantine families in the eleventh century, may also have been of Armenian origin. The first known member of this family was Damianos whom we find Duke of Antioch in 995. He was killed in 998 fighting the Saracens. His four sons [46] occupied important positions in the military and administrative organization of the empire. One of them, Constantine, apparently a popular figure, was twice considered for the throne, once in 1028 at the time of the death of Constantine VIII and again in 1042 following the overthrow of Michael V. His daughter became the wife of Constantine Ducas, the future Emperor. Another female member of the family, a descendant of Theophylact, a son of Damianos, became the mother of Alexius Comnenus. The family originally came from Dalassa, a place which, according to Adontz who has written the history of the family, was an Armenian center located in the mountainous region to the east of Melitene known as Claudia. It is on this ground that he gives to the family an Armenian origin. His argument, if not entirely convincing, is, nevertheless, impressive (171).

Adontz has written the history of another Byzantine family, this one certainly of Armenian origin (172). The Armenian district of Taron, it will be recalled, was ceded to the empire by the brothers Gregory and Pancratios (Bagrat) who were given other lands located elsewhere in the empire. Discontented with this arrangement at first, the Taronite brothers joined Bardas Skleros in his rebellion, but were subsequently reconciled with Basil II, were entrusted with important commands, and established themselves in the military and administrative life of the empire. The family of Gregory particularly prospered. His son Ashot was married to the daughter of the Bulgarian King Samuel. Ashot's descendants intermarried with the Melissenoi and the Comneni, two of the most prominent Byzantine families of the eleventh century (173). They are known to have held important positions down to the middle of the twelfth century.

A branch of the Taronites, the Tornikios family, survived still longer, holding important military and administrative positions down to the beginning of the fourteenth century. We first meet with members of this family in 945 when a Nicolas and Leo Tornikios helped Constantine Porphyrogenitus to eliminate the Lecapeni from the throne. It is not until the eleventh century, however, that we find members of this family occupying important military posts. In 1047 one of them, Leo Tornikios, attempted to seize the throne. His failure was less heroic than that of another Armenian, George Maniakes, the famous general, who had attempted the same thing several years earlier (1042) (174). The John Tornikios who aided the [47] imperial forces at the time of the rebellion of Bardas Skleros belonged to the Georgian branch of the family, in its origins also Armenian (175).

Among those who supported Bardas Skleros at the time of his rebellion there was a certain Sachakios Vrachamios. Vrachamios was at the time, according to one source, an army general, according to another, the head of an important bureau. In any case, he was an important personage, already active during the reign of John Tzimiskes. A number of other persons, belonging to the same family and occupying positions of some importance, are known, but as all the information at our disposal is derived from seals, not much can be said about them. There is one, however, who figures prominently in the literary sources. This is Philaretus who, following the Byzantine disaster at Mentzikert in 1071, carved out a principality for himself in the Taurus mountains which was eventually extended to include the cities of Melitene, Antioch and Edessa. His forces consisted almost entirely of Armenians. The Vrachamios family was, of course, Armenian in origin (176).

In this analysis of the Armenian element in the leadership of the empire for the period under consideration, a number of other personages of Armenian origin might have been mentioned. For instance, the Machitars who appear in the service of the empire during the last quarter of the tenth century--the first Machitar seems to have been governor of Lycandos sometime after 973--and continued until the end of the eleventh century (177), or, the Kekaumenoi who produced two important personages in the eleventh century, Katakalon, one of the ablest

Byzantine generals of the period, and the author Kekaumenos, the able and wise provincial administrator, whose work is no doubt the most original political treatise in the literature of Byzantium (178). One might mention also the Georgian-Armenian families of Apocapes and Pacurianus, members of both of which [48] are known to have held important positions in the eleventh century (179). Enough has been said, however, to show how important the Armenian element was among those who directed the destiny of the empire during what was the most brilliant period in its history.

# *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*

by Peter Charanis

---

### III.

[48] In their relations with Armenian chieftains the Byzantines developed the practice of having them yield their possessions to the empire in return for lands located elsewhere in the empire and also for titles and offices. It was an effective way, at least in some instances, of extending the frontier eastward and at the same time integrating recalcitrant elements into the military and political life of the empire. The practice may already be noted under Basil I when, it will be recalled, the Armenian Kourtikios who turned Locana over to the empire, was given a place in the military organization of the empire. It may be noted under Leo VI when another Armenian chieftain, Manuel, ceded Tekis to the empire. Manuel, it will be recalled, moved to Constantinople where he was showered with honors while two of his sons were given new holdings in the region of Trebizond and the other two, important military commands. It was in this way too that the district of Taron had been definitely annexed to the empire in 966. The dispossessed princes were not always happy with the new arrangement but they usually ended, as it has been pointed out above in connection with the Taronites, by integrating themselves into the military and political life of the empire.

This practice was applied on a large scale during the reign of Basil II and resulted in the annexation by the empire of virtually all Armenia. In most instances, the cessions were induced under pressure and not infrequently force was required to bring about actual annexation.

The first important annexation thus made was the domain of the Curopolates David, a Georgian potentate of Armenian origin. The region [49] known as the Taik constituted the core of his territories, but the latter extended from Manzikert, north of Lake Van, to Erzerum on the upper Euphrates and northward to the district of Kola and Artans, northwest of Kars. David had aided Basil II at the time of the revolt of Bardas Skleros, but some years later he sided with Bardas Phocas when the latter rose in revolt against the same Emperor (987). It was no doubt in order to escape the vengeance of the victorious Emperor that David made him his heir so that when he died in 1000, apparently the victim of poison, administered perhaps at the instigation of the Emperor, his realm was annexed to the empire and became the theme of Iberia (180).

The annexation of Taik was followed some years later (1022) by that of Vaspurakan. Vaspurakan, which extended from Lake Van to the Araxes and to the chain of mountains which today separates Turkey from Iran, was ceded to the empire apparently because its king, Senacherim, was no longer able to withstand the various foreign and internal pressures, especially the invasion of the Seljuk Turks. The newly annexed country was organized into a catepanate, *i. e.*, a frontier province (181).

The annexation of Vaspurakan had hardly been completed when Basil II received a bequest which resulted eventually in the acquisition of another important Armenian territory. The bequest came from Sempad (Smbat) of Ani, King of Greater Armenia who, having sided with Georgi, the King of the nascent Georgian feudal monarchy, against Basil, had become rather uneasy concerning the intentions of the Byzantine Emperor. Its substance was that while Sempad would continue to rule his realm until his death, the Byzantine emperor was to be his successor. When Sempad died in 1041, however, he was succeeded by his nephew Gagik who, while ready to acknowledge the suzerainty of the emperor, refused to turn his kingdom over to the empire. But the pressures which were brought to bear against him were in the end too strong and he was forced to abdicate. Thus, Ani and the Kingdom of Greater Armenia were annexed to the empire in 1045 (182). About the same time Gregory Pahlavuni, a learned Armenian better known as Gregory the Magister, yielded to the empire the stronghold of Bgni, located some distance to the east of Ani on the [50] Churastan (Hurastan) river (183). And in 1064 Gagik, prince of Kars, also ceded his possessions to Byzantium (184).

Thus virtually all Armenia had now become an integral part of the Byzantine empire. The newly acquired land was, of course, inhabited predominantly by Armenians. There were also some Georgians and perhaps elements of other nationalities, but there were no Greeks. This at least, is the impression given by the statement of a native of the theme of Cappadocia, obviously Greek-speaking, who had migrated to Taik about the middle of the eleventh century. "I became an emigrant", he writes, "and I went a distance of one and one-half weeks from my fatherland. And I settled among alien nations with strange religion and tongue". Among the "alien nations" to which he alludes, he mentions only the Armenians (185).

The Armenian princes whose territories were annexed were settled and given lands elsewhere in the empire. Thus Senacherim, the former king of Vaspurakan, together with his three sons, was settled in Sebasteia where he was given extensive possessions. Other lands located in Larissa on the upper Tochma-su, Abara or Amara, placed by Honigmann on the road from Sebasteia to Melitene, somewhat to the northeast of the latter. and Gabadonia, today Develi, south of Caesarea, were also given to him (186). Gagik, the former king of Ani, was given extensive new possessions in the themes of Cappadocia, Charsianon and Lycandos (187). Gregory Pahlavuni and Gagik of Kars were also similarly rewarded. The new lands given to Gregory were located in the theme of Mesopotamia (188), while those of Gagik of Kars were scattered in various places, some located at Tzamandos, others at Larissa and still others at Amasia and Comana. Gagik fixed his residence at Tzamandos (189). The Armenian princes were also honored with important titles. Senacherim was named patrician (190), Gagik of Ani, magister (191), Gregory Pahlavuni magister and dux of Mesopotamia and in addition was entrusted with the administration of a part of Taron, Sasun and Vaspurakan (192).

The displaced Armenian princes took along with them to their new domicile, besides their families, a numerous retinue consisting primarily [51] of their nobility and the latter's following. So numerous indeed was the nobility that followed their princes that their going is said to have emptied Armenia of the most valiant elements of its population. The Greeks, wrote Matthew of Edessa, "Dispersed the most courageous children of Armenia" (193). "Their most constant care was to scatter from the orient all that there was of courageous men and valiant generals of Armenian origin" (194). Of the actual number involved in this displacement no figure can be given. The national Armenian historian Tchamtchian puts those who followed Senacherim to his new domicile at 400,000 (195) and this figure has been repeated by others (195), but there is nothing in the existing sources which bears this figure out. All that we have is the figure of a medieval Armenian historian who says that Senacherim was followed by 16,000 of his compatriots, not counting the women and children (197). But whatever the final figure, there can be little doubt that the number of Armenians who left their homes and settled elsewhere in the empire was a large one. The repeated raids of the Seljuk Turks which began in earnest about this time increased this number still more, and gave to the movement of the Armenians away from their native homes the aspect of a mass migration. The chroniclers who report this movement no doubt exaggerate in their descriptions (198), but their accounts, after allowance has been made for this exaggeration remain nevertheless impressive. Armenians by the thousands left their homeland and went to settle in northern Syria, in Cappadocia, and in Cilicia where they laid the basis for the foundation later in the eleventh century of new Armenian principalities and, toward the end of the twelfth century, of the feudal kingdom of Little Armenia.

When the Armenians began to move into Cappadocia, Cilicia, and northern Syria sometime after the middle of the tenth century, they were, no doubt, as we have already observed, encouraged by the imperial authorities, anxious to repeople the various towns newly captured from the Saracens, particularly in Cilicia and northern Syria, which had suffered considerable losses in population as the result of the departure of most of the Moslems. Their displacement in the eleventh century served a similar purpose, but its primary objective was to assure the peaceful control of the newly acquired Armenian lands by removing the various elements that might be a source of trouble. This was traditional Byzantine policy which had often worked. This time, however, it proved to be one [52] of the major factors in the breakdown of Byzantine authority in Asia Minor. For the displacement of the Armenians, coming as it did at a time when their homeland was being subjected to the repeated raids of the Seljuks, had removed the element which, fighting for its native land, might have checked these raids. But more important, the displacement of the Armenians weakened the position of the empire in the regions in which they were settled. For, in some of these regions as, for instance, in Cappadocia, their settlement disturbed the social and ethnic complexion and so created serious tensions, while in others, as for instance, Cilicia and northern Syria, the new settlers were ready to start separatist movements the moment the opportunity



presented itself (199). What particularly contributed to the development of tension between the Armenian element and the rest of the population were the ecclesiastical problems which the annexation of the Armenian lands and the consequent dispersion of the Armenians had created. There had always been heretical groups in the empire, but orthodoxy, as it finally crystalized, had come to prevail as one of the unifying forces of the empire--the Greek language and the imperial tradition were the other two--but now for the first time since the loss of Egypt and Syria in the seventh century there was a powerful religious minority, dominant in certain regions of the empire, very strong in others. Both church and state were very much concerned about this situation and, as a consequence, brought pressure to bear upon the Armenians to accept the orthodox point of view. But the Armenians, whose cultural and national development was strongly associated with their religious beliefs and practices, resisted stubbornly. As a result, the efforts of the Byzantine church to bring them in line made of them dubious subjects (200). The Armenian element in the Byzantine army was as dominant as ever, but one could no longer be sure of its loyalty (201). Equally questionable was the loyalty of the civil population (202). Still the number of Armenians holding [53] important military commands in the eleventh is as impressive as that of any other century (203). And if many of them did not integrate themselves definitely into the social, political, and military life of the empire as in the past it was largely because of the changed political conditions in Asia Minor.

---

# *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*

by Peter Charanis

---

## IV.

[53] The defeat of the Byzantine army by the Seljuks at the battle of Mentzikert in 1071 coupled with the civil wars which followed in Byzantium resulted in the definite loss by the empire of eastern and central Asia Minor. This loss included, of course, the regions inhabited by the Armenians. To be sure a territory of considerable extent, stretching from Tarsus in Cilicia to the mountainous country of the upper Pyramus (Gaihan) around Albistan and Marash (Germaniceia) and thence eastward to take in the Mesopotamian regions of the empire around Melitene. Rumanopolis and Edessa and also into Syria to include Antioch, remained for a while, at least nominally, under the jurisdiction of the empire. It was in this territory, it will be recalled, that the Armenians, who had left their homes in connection with the great migration of the late tenth and the eleventh century, had settled. The territory had been salvaged by the Armenian Philaretus who at the time of the battle of Mentzikert was in the service of the empire and bore the title of Great Domestic. Philaretus acted at first as an independent ruler, but, beginning with 1078, he seems to have acknowledged the suzerainty of the Byzantine emperor and was given in return the title of curopalates (204). It was not long, however, before his domain disintegrated. Antioch fell to the Turks in 1084; Edessa and Melitene continued for some time longer to be ruled by Armenian potentates who bore Byzantine titles but who in reality had no effective connections with the empire. But these too were finally lost. Edessa fell to the Crusaders under Baldwin in 1098 (205); Melitene to the Danishmend Turks in 1101 (206). Only in Cilicia, where other Armenian chieftains had established themselves (207), were the Byzantines under the Comneni in the twelfth [54] century able to reassert their authority, but even here, though Armenian barons might fight in their armies and Armenians might refer to their emperors as "our emperors" (208), their hold on the Armenian population was always precarious.

It may be said, therefore, that the battle of Mentzikert and the subsequent loss by the empire of eastern and central Asia Minor brought to an end the great role which, beginning with the end of the sixth century, the Armenians had played in the political and military life of the empire. But Armenians continued to live in the empire down to its very end (209). Two colonies of them, for instance, are known to have existed in western Asia Minor in the thirteenth century. One of them was located near Smyrna, the other around Abydus and in the valley of the Scamander (210). About the origin of these two colonies nothing definite can be said. The one near Smyrna may have been old, going back perhaps to the Armenian settlement in the neighborhood of Priene which is known to have existed in the tenth century. That around Abydus and in the valley of the Scamander, judging from its bitter hostility to the Greeks, may have been more recent, the result perhaps of the transfer of Armenians from another region, as that, for instance, which was effected by John II Comnenus when he took Anazarbus in 1138 (211). When after the fall of Constantinople in 1204 Henry of Flanders crossed over into Asia Minor in an attempt to conquer this region for the Latin empire, the Armenians of this colony flocked to his standards and helped him take Abydus which he entrusted to an Armenian garrison. When, however, shortly afterwards, Henry crossed back over into Europe, the Armenians who had taken his side went there also. They followed him because they feared the vengeance of the Greeks, but in the end they did not escape this vengeance. Settled in Thrace, they were attacked and destroyed by the Greeks in that region. We are told that the Armenians who had followed Henry into Europe numbered 20,000 and that they took along with them their wives and children. Though this figure is, no doubt, an [55] exaggeration, it does serve to indicate that the Armenian colony around Abydus and in the valley of the Scamander was a numerous one (212).

Armenian colonies continued to exist also in the European provinces of the empire. The Armenians had come there for trade and other purposes, but primarily through the policy of forced transfers, a policy to which the Byzantines, as the reader already knows, resorted very frequently. Byzantine historians of the twelfth century often refer to Armenians inhabiting the country around Philippopolis, especially in order to emphasize their

disloyalty to the empire. Though what these historians had in mind were the Paulicians of this region, many of whom at this time, were racially not Armenian in origin, there can be no doubt that the population of Philippopolis and the surrounding country included also Armenians (213). There were Armenians in most of the large towns of the empire. They were particularly numerous in Constantinople (214) and also in Thessalonica where they are known to have possessed in the thirteenth century a church of their own (215). But besides the Armenians who lived in Thessalonica there were others who dwelt in villages nearby. Armenian villages situated elsewhere in the European regions of the empire are known to have existed at least as late as the end of the twelfth century. An Armenian village was located in the Rila mountains not far south from Dupnica and Samokov in Bulgaria; another near Bitolj in the southwestern corner of what is now Serbian Macedonia; and there were Armenians in the towns of Stromitza and Moglena and along the river Pchinja (216). Though nothing definite can be said about the origin of these Armenian villages, it is quite possible that they went back to the period of Basil II, who, it will be recalled, had settled numerous Armenians in Macedonia, some of whom deserted to the Bulgars (217).

[56] The hostility to the Greeks shown by the Armenians of Abydus at the time when Henry of Flanders tried to conquer that region was not peculiar to that particular group, but reflects the attitude of the Armenians of the empire in general. Known instances of the expression of this attitude are very numerous. This has been noted and commented upon by modern scholars. "The Armenian", writes J. Laurent, "was never able to fraternize completely with the Greeks. However high he may have risen in the empire, however great his fortunes may have been, however devoted the services which he may have rendered in the army and in the administration, the Armenian never became a Byzantine like others. He kept at least for himself and his private life, his language, his habits, his customs and his national religion; grouped with him were other Armenians, immigrants like him; instead of hellenizing himself in Greece, he armenized the Greek territories where he settled; he remained in the Byzantine empire an unassimilated foreign element, which on occasions became dangerous" (218). And elsewhere in the same paper: "There it is how at the hour of danger, when the Seljuk Turks were depriving the Byzantine empire of Asia Minor, Byzantium, instead of finding defenders in the Armenians whom it had established in its territories, saw them stand against it and contribute to the success of its ferocious adversaries" (219).

Another scholar who himself points out the distrust and dislike of the Armenians for the Byzantine empire has called this statement "fantastic-nonsense" (220). Runciman touches upon the Armenians only incidentally and as a consequence, his studies concerning them are less exhaustive than those of Laurent, but his judgment in that matter is certainly closer to the truth. There is no doubt at all that Greeks and Armenians disliked each other and that at times this dislike turned into bitter hostility and found expression in atrocious deeds as, for instance, that of Gagik, the dispossessed king of Ani, who had the Greek bishop of Caesaria seized and put into a sack together with his large dog and then had his men beat bishop and dog until the maddened animal tore his master to shreds (221). There is no doubt either, as the reader already knows and later generations among the Armenians acknowledged (222), that this hostility between Greeks and [57] Armenians was an important factor in the conquest of Asia Minor by the Seljuk Turks. But to say that "however high he may have risen in the empire, however great his fortunes may have been, however devoted the services which he may have rendered in the army and in the administration, the Armenian never became a Byzantine like others" is indeed to talk nonsense, as anyone who knows something about the role of the Armenians in Byzantine society can readily see.

For something like five hundred years, Armenians played an important role in the political, military and administrative life of the Byzantine empire. They served as soldiers and officers, as administrators and emperors. In the early part of this period during the seventh and eighth centuries, when the empire was fighting for its very existence, they contributed greatly in turning back its enemies. But particularly great was their role in the ninth and tenth centuries when as soldiers and officers, administrators and emperors they dominated the social, military and political life of the empire and were largely responsible for its greatness. So dominant indeed was their role during this period that one may refer to the Byzantine empire of these two centuries as Graeco-Armenian; 'Graeco', because as always, its civilization was Greek, 'Armenian', because the element which directed its destinies and provided the greater part of the forces for its defense was largely Armenian or of Armenian origin. It was a role, moreover, of world-wide historical significance for it was during this period that the empire achieved its greatest success, when its armies triumphed everywhere, its missionaries spread the

gospel and with it civilization among the southeastern Slavs, and its scholars resurrected Greek antiquity, thus making possible the preservation of its literature. Herein lies perhaps the most important part of the legacy of the Armenians to civilization. But while all this may be true, the point should be made and made with emphasis that the Armenians in Byzantium who furnished it with its leadership were thoroughly integrated into its political and military life, identified themselves with its interest and adopted the principal features of its culture. In brief, like many other elements of different racial origins, as, for instance, Saracens, Slavs and Turks, who had a similar experience, they became Byzantines.

# *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*

by Peter Charanis

## Footnotes

### [Bibliography](#)

---

[12]

1. Genesisius, *Historia*. Bonn, 1834, 33.

2. A. A. Vasiliev-H. Grégoire, *Byzance et les Arabes*, I. Brussels, 1935, 31, Note 2. Cf. F. Hirsch, *Byzantinische Studien*. Leipzig, 1876, 131.

---

[13]

3 E. W. Brooks, *Iohannis Ephesini historiae ecclesiasticae pars tertia*, CSCO. Louvain, 1936, 61-62 (English trans. R. Payne Smith, Oxford, 1860, 125-126); Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, I. Leipzig, 1883, 245.

4 H. Gelzer, *Pergamon unter Byzantinern und Osmanen*. (Abhandlungen der Königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften) Berlin, 1903, 42 f.

5 H. Grégoire, *Précisions géographiques et chronologiques sur les Pauliciens*, Académie royale de Belgique: Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques, 5 Ser., 33 (Brussels, 1947) 294 f., 298 f.; S. Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee*, Cambridge, 1947, 34.

6 Strabo, 12. 3. 36.

7 Ghevond, *Histoire des guerres et des conquêtes des Arabes en Arménie*, tr. from Armenian by G. V. Chahnazarian. Paris, 1856, 22, 33-34; cf. J. Laurent, *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam depuis la conquête arabe jusqu'en 886*. Paris. 1919, 184, note 4; Muyltermans, *La domination Arabe en Arménie...* Paris, 1927, 98-99.

8 Ghevond, 129.

---

[14]

9 *Ibid.*, 162.

10 Stephen (Asoghik) of Taron, *Histoire universelle* (1e partie), tr. from Armenian by E. Dulaurier. Paris, 1883. (Publications de l'Ecole des Langues Orientales Vivantes, XVIII), 162.

11 Procopius, *De bello Gothico*, III, 32, 7; cf. R. Grousset, *Histoire de L'Arménie des origines à 1071*. Paris, 1947, 242. Grousset's statement concerning vast transfers of Armenians to Thrace by Justinian is not borne out by his references.

12 Evagrius Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier. London, 1898, 215. The translation is taken from the English version of Evagrius which appeared in Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library: Theodoret and Evagrius, *History of the Church*. London, 1854, 444.

13 N. Adontz has tried to prove the Armenian origin of Maurice: *Les légendes de Maurice et de Constantin V, empereurs de Byzance*, *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales*, 2. Brussels, 1934, 1-12: but see P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam*, I. Paris, 1951, 34-41.

---

[15]

14 Sebeos, *Histoire d'Heradius*, tr. from Armenian by F. Macler. Paris, 1904, 30-31. Cf. F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, I. Munich, 1924, p. 13, No. 108.

15 Nicephorus, *Opuscula Historica*, ed. C. de Boor. Leipzig, 1880, 65, 66; Theophanes, I, 427, 429; Michael Syrus, *Chronique*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, 2. Paris, 1901, 518, 521, 523; Agapius of Menbidj, *Histoire universelle*, tr. A. A. Vasiliev, *Patrologia Orientalis*, 8 (1912), 544; Ghevond, *op. cit.*, 126-127.

16 Agapius of Menbidj, 531, 538; Dionysius I of Tell-Mahre, *Chronique*, tr. J.-B. Chabot. Paris, 1895, 56-57. Cf. A. Lombard, *Etudes d'histoire byzantine. Constantin V, empereur des Romains (740-775)*. Paris, 1902, 35.

17 Theophanes, I, 451-452; Ghevond, *op. cit.*, 150; Michael Syrus, 3, 2.

18 For a careful examination of this tradition see N. Adontz, *L'Age et l'origine de l'empereur Basil I*, *Byzantion* 8 (1933) 475-500; 9 (1934) 257 ff.

---

[16]

19 Cedrenus, *Historiarum Compendium*. Bonn, 1839, 2, 382; Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, 2. Bonn, 1878, 298 f.

20 Stephen (Asoghik) of Taron, *Histoire universelle* (deuxième partie), tr. from Armenian by F. Macler. Paris, 1917, 74.

21 P. Charanis, *The Chronicle of Monemvasia and the Question of the Slavonic Settlements in Greece*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 5 (1950) 154-155.

22 Theophanes, I, 469.

23 H. Grégoire, *La carrière du premier Nicephore Phocas*, II. Thessalonica, 1953, 251 [see *Bibliography*].

24 Leo Diaconus, *Historia*. Bonn, 1828, 28.

25 P. Charanis, *On the Ethnic Composition of Byzantine Asia Minor in the Thirteenth Century*, II. 142 ff [see *Bibliography*].

26 P. Charanis, *Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 13 (1959) 31.

---

[17]

27 *Ibid.*, 31.

28 Evagrius, 209 f.

29 Theophanes, I, 251.

30 John of Ephesus, Smith, 407, Brooks, 234.

31 *Ibid.*; Smith, 207, Brooks, 113.

32 Theophylactus Simocatta, *Historia*, ed. C. de Boor. Leipzig, 1887, 67.

33 *Ibid.*, 104.

34 Michael Syrus, 2, 72.

---

[18]

33 Sebeos, 35.

36 Cf. Goubert, *op. cit.*, I, 197.

37 Sebeos, 36-37. Cf. Goubert, *op. cit.*, I, 200; Dölger, *op. cit.* 12, No. 94.

38 Theophylactus Simocatta, 205, 216.

39 Sebeos, 54-55. Cf. Goubert, *op. cit.*, I: 209; Dölger, *op. cit.* 16, No. 137.

40 On some recent theories concerning the spread of military estates, see: Charanis, *Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century*, 33, note 60a.

41 The father of the Emperor Heraclius, also named Heraclius, who served as general during the reign of Maurice is said to have been a native of a city located in Armenia. Theophylactus Simocatta, 109-110. John of Nikiu calls the Emperor Heraclius a Cappadocian: *Chronique*, tr. H. Zotenberg. Paris, 1883, 431.

42 Theophanes, I, 304, 309, 316; Nicephorus, 15; Agapius of Menbidj, 463. Cf. H. Grégoire, *An Armenian Dynasty on the Byzantine Throne*, *Armenian Quarterly* I (1946) 9.

---

[19]

43 For a detailed study of the theme system with references to the older literature see A. Pertusi, *Constantino Porfirogenito De Thematibus*, *Studi e Testi*, Vatican, 1952, 160.

44 *Ibid.*, 117-120.

45 This is the opinion of George Ostrogorsky which, though it has been recently contested, appears to me plausible. For a rejection of this view: J. Karayannopulos, *Die Entstehung der byzantinischen Themenordnung*, Munich, 1959; A. Pertusi, *La formation des thèmes byzantins*, *Berichte zum XI. internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongress. München 1958* (Munich, 1958) I, 1-40. But see G. Ostrogorsky, *Korreferat zu A. Pertusi, "La formation des thèmes byzantins"*, *Ibid.*, I, 1-8.

46 Constantin Porphyrogenitus, *De thematibus*, ed. Pertusi (Note 43 above), p. 63.

---

[20]

47 F. Cumont, *L'Annexion du pont polemoniaque et de la Petite Armenie*. *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsey*. Manchester, 1923, 115.

48 Bury, citing Adontz, says that in "the period after Justinian, and indirectly as a consequence of his policy" the Armenians expanded "westward towards Caesarea and northward towards the Black Sea": *History of the Later Roman Empire*. London, 1923, 2, 346, note 1. Cf. N. Adontz, *Armenia in the Epoch of Justinian*. St. Petersburg, 1908 (in Russian), 203 [English translation appeared in 1970]. Adontz uses as his source the *De Thematibus* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. As I know no Russian, I consulted Adontz's book with the aid of Cyril Mango.

49 Theophanes, I, 469.

50 For Sebasteia at the beginning of the tenth century: Constantine Prophyrogenitus, *De Ceremoniis*. Bonn, 1829, 652.

51 H. Grégoire, *Les Arméniens entre Byzance et l'Islam*. Byzantion 10 (1935) 665.

---

[21]

52 E. W. Brooks, *Arabic Lists of the Byzantine Themes*, The Journal of Hellenic Studies 21 (1901) 72-76 and note 5 on p. 75.

53 Kodama in M. J. de Goeje, *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, 6. Lugduni-Batavorum, 1889, 196-199. For an important amendment relating to the strength of the Armeniacs, H. Gelzer, *Die Genesis der byzantinischen Themenverfassung*. Leipzig, 1899, 97-98. Cf. Pertusi, *Constantino Porfirogenito de thematibus*, p. 118, who is inclined to accept the amendment: Kodama does not give the strength of Macedonia, but according to the source made available by Brooks, it numbered 5,000.

54 As for instance the Anatolikon and the Thracesian: Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Ceremoniis*, 652, 657, 667.

55 For the documentation of what follows see Charanis, *Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century*, 34-36.

---

[23]

56 Symeon Magister. Bonn, 1838, 603.

57 Adontz, *Sur l'origine de Léon V, empereur de Byzance*, *Armeniaca*, 2 (1927), 1-10.

58 *Ibid.*, 9.

59 According to one tradition Michael's grandfather was a Jew who had been converted to Christianity: Michael Syrus, 3: 72.

60 The Armenian origin of Theodora is well known. Cf. G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*. New Brunswick, N. J., 1957, 195. Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*. Bonn, 1838, 148, where Manuel, uncle of Theodora, is referred to as Armenian. Though there is some confusion about the career of this Manuel, this confusion does not affect the Armenian origin of Theodora's family. Cf. H. Grégoire, *Études sur le neuvième siècle*, *Byzantion* 8 (1933) 524.

---

[24]

61 Symeon Magister, 687; Georgius Monachus. Bonn, 1838, 839.

62 Theoph. Continuatus, 205; Georgius Monachus, 834.

63 Theoph. Continuatus, 89.

64 Theoph. Continuatus, 175; Cedrenus, 2, 161. Cf. Vasiliev - Grégoire, *Byzance et les Arabes*, 1, 147, Note 1. On his Armenian descent, cf. P. Peeters, *Acta Sanctorum, Novembris, Tomus Quartus*. Brussels, 1925, 546; J. B. Bury, *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire*, 429.

65 Theoph. Continuatus, 175; Cedrenus, 2, 161; Peeters, *op. cit.*, 546, Note 3; Vasiliev - Grégoire, *op. cit.*, 1, 221, Note 2.



66 Theoph. Continuatus, 175, 354, 398.

---

[25]

67 *Ibid.*, 57 f, 62 f.

68 *Ibid.*, 18, 24, 110, 120-121, 127, 148; Genesisius, 52, 68.

69 Grégoire, *Études sur le neuvième siècle*. Byzantion 8 (1933) 524; F. Dvornik, *The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm*. Dumbarton Oaks Papers 7 (1953) 69 f.

70 Theoph. Continuatus, 150, 194, 196, 229, 238; Georgius Monachus, 835; Cedrenus 2, 280; C. de Boor, "Zu Genesisios", *Byz. Zeitschr.* 10 (1901), 62-65.

71 Theoph. Continuatus, 107 f.; Symeon Magister, 630; Cedrenus, 2, 118. Cf. Bury, *History of the Eastern Roman Empire*, 126, Note 3.

72 Cedrenus, 2, 119.

---

[26]

73 Theoph. Continuatus, 224 f., 226, 229.

74 Adontz, *L'Age et l'origine de l'empereur Basil I*, Byzantion 9 (1934) 229.

75 Symeon Magister, 678; Georgius Monachus, 830; Genesisius, 106; Theodosius Melitenus, *Chronographia*, ed. T. L. F. Tafel. Munich, 1859, 170.

76 Symeon Magister, 688; Georgius Monachus, 837, edition by E. de Muralt. St. Petersburg, 1861, 750; Theodosius Melitenus, 176. Cf. J. B. Bury, *History of the Eastern Roman Empire*, 458-479; Adontz, *L'Age et l'origine de l'empereur Basil I*, Byzantion, 9 (1934) 299 ff.

77 Adontz, *ibid.*, 231.

---

[27]

78 Grégoire, *Manuel et Théophobe ou la concurrence de deux monastères*, Byzantion 9 (1934) 185 ff.

---

[28]

79 Theoph. Continuatus, 154. Cf. Lebeau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* 13. Paris, 1832, 14, Note 3. Bury, *History of the Eastern Roman Empire*, 60, Note 3. His Armenian origin is further indicated by his father's name, Pancratius, and by that of his brother's, Arshavir. See further: Cyril Mango, *The Homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, English Translation, Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge, Mass., 1958, 240-243. Leo as relative or cousin of John: Theoph. Continuatus, 185; Cedrenus, 2, 166. For biographical references concerning the career of Leo see Mango, *op. cit.*, 161-162.

80 Theoph. Continuatus, 175. Cf. Bury, *History of the Eastern Roman Empire*, 156, Note 1. Arshavir, Photius' uncle, must not be confused with Arshavir, the brother of John the Grammarian. See Adontz, *Role of the Armenians in Byzantine Science*, *Armenian Review*, vol 3, No. 3 (1950) 66.

---

[29]

81 Theoph. Continuatus, 268; Cedrenus, 2, 207; J. G. C. Anderson, *The Campaign of Basil I Against the Paulicians in 872 A.D.* The Classical Review 10 (1896) 136 f.; E. Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches*. Brussels, 1935, 74.

82 Theoph. Continuatus, 268; Cedrenus, 2, 207.

83 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. by Gy. Moravcsik and tr. into English by R. J. H. Jenkins (Budapest, 1949), 226-227; *De Thematibus*, ed. Pertusi, 73, and 139 f. for commentary by editor. Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 69. According to Jenkins the theme of Mesopotamia was created sometime between 899 and 901; R. J. H. Jenkins, B. Laourdas, C. A. Mango, "Nine Orations of Arethas from Cod. Marc. Gr. 524", *Byz. Zeit.* 47 (1954), 15. See also Const. Porph. *De Administrando Imperio*, vol. II, *Commentary*, ed. by R. J. H. Jenkins (London, 1962), 189.

84 In the location of these regions I have followed Honigmann, *op. cit.* 55, 64-66, and Map II at end of book. For the road system of Asia Minor see J. G. C. Anderson, *The Road System of Eastern Asia Minor with the Evidence of Byzantine Campaigns*, The Journal of Hellenic Studies 17 (1897) 22-44 and plate I at the end of the volume. Honigmann does not agree with Anderson in the location of certain places.

---

[30]

85 Const. Porphy., *De Administrando Imperio*, Moravcsik and Jenkins, 238-240. Bonn, 227-228; *De Thematibus*, Pertusi, 75-76, 143-146 (Bonn, 32-35); Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 64. On Melias: P. Kyriakides, [see *Bibliography*] Thessalonica, 1932, 320-326; Grégoire, *Notes épigraphiques*, VII, Byzantion 8 (1933) 79 ff. Cf. John Mavrogordato, *Digenes Akrites*, Oxford, 1956, liii.

86 M. Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdaniides de Jariza et de Syrie*. Paris, 1953, 736.

---

[31]

87 Const. Porph. *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. Moravcsik and Jenkins, 238 (Bonn, 226-227); *De Thematibus*, ed. Pertusi, 140. Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 70 and 90-92 for the location of Romanopolis. In a posthumous memoir published in 1961 Honigmann, revising his earlier view, places Romanopolis to the east of Arsamosata at Gabalgur, Armenian Chapaghjur, near the modern city of Chapakchur: E. Honigmann, *Trois Mémoires posthumes d'histoire et de géographie de l'orient chrétien* (= Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe des Lettres et de Sciences Morales et Politiques. Mémoire. Tome LIV) (Brussels, 1961), 85-123. I retain his earlier location on the grounds that, given the geographical disposition of Chozanon and Asmosaton, it is difficult to see how Romanopolis could have been annexed to Mesopotamia if it were actually located where Honigmann in his revised view puts it.

88 Const. Porphy., *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. Moravcsik and Jenkins, 238 (Bonn, 226); Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 77; Canard, *op. cit.*, 737.

89 On Charpezikion: Const. Porphy., *De Ceremoniis*, 662, 666, 667, 669; Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 75-77. On Chozanon, Const. Porphy., *De Administrando Imperio*, Moravcsik and Jenkins, 238 (Bonn, 226); Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 77-78; Canard, *op. cit.*, 762, Note 99.

90 Yahya Ibn Said, tr. into French by M. Canard in *Extraits des Sources Arabes*. Brussels, 1950 (= Vasiliev-Grégoire, *Byzance et les Arabes*, II, 2), 95; Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 79, note 2, 230.

91 Cedrenus, 2, 375; Adontz, *Notes Arméno-Byzantines*, Byzantion 9 (1934) 374 f.; *Les Taronites en Arménie et a Byzance*, Byzantion 10 (1935) 541 f.; Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 48 f.; Grousset, *op. cit.*, 493 f.

92 Stephen (Asoghik) of Taron, tr. Macler, 141; German translation, H. Gelzer and A. Burckhardt (*Scriptores sacri et profani*, 4). Leipzig, 1907, 196.

---

[32]

93 H. Gelzer, *Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatum*, K. Akademie der Wissenschaften, München, Phil.-hist. Abteilung, Abhandlungen 51, Munich, 1901, 563, Note 2. Cf. Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 68.

94 Fr. Tournebize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie*. Paris, 1900, 154.

95 Bar Hebraeus, *Chronography*, tr. by E. A. W. Budge, Oxford, 1932, 1, 169.

96 Honigmann, *Malatya*, The Encyclopaedia of Islam 3. London, 1936, 194. Cf. Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdanides...*, 736.

97 Grégoire, *Notes épigraphiques*, 82 f.

98 Bar Hebraeus, *op. cit.*, 169.

---

[33]

99 Ibn Zafir, tr. Canard, *Extraits des Sources Arabes*, 125; Dahibi, *Ibid.*, 243 f.; Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdanides...*, 779. For Turks, Khorasanians and Khazars in Constantinople at the beginning of the tenth century: A. A. Vasiliev, *Harun-Ibn Yahya and his Description of Constantinople*, *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 5 (1932) 158.

100 Cedrenus, 2, 361.

101 Mas'udi, tr. Canard, *Extraits des sources arabes*, 34, 36, Tabari, *Ibid.*, 12, Ibn Hauqal, *Ibid.*, 419-421.

102 Const. Porphy., *De Ceremoniis*, 1, 652 ff, 666 ff.; Leo Diaconus, *op. cit.*, 14; G. Schlumberger, *Un empereur byzantin au dixième siècle: Nicephore Phocas*. Paris, 1890, 46.

103 Grégoire, *La carrière du premier Nicéphore Phocas*, 235 f., 251; Const. Porphy., *De Ceremoniis*, 1, 661.

104 Stephen (Asoghik) of Taron, *op. cit.*, 45. Cf. Adontz, *Samuel l'Arménien, roi des Bulgares*, *Mémoires de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres*, 38 (1938) 49.

105 Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdanides...*, 731 ff.

106 Mutanabbi, tr. Canard, *Extraits des Sources Arabes*, 323.

---

[34]

107 Cedrenus, 2, 361; Bar Hebraeus, *op. cit.*, 168; Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdanides...*, 807, 822.

108 Cedrenus, 2, 419; Stephen (Asoghik) of Taron, tr. Macler, 56; Adontz, *Notes Arméno-Byzantines*, 380; Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdanides...*, 844-845.

109 Nicephorus Phocas, *De velitatione bellica*. Bonn, 1828, with Leo Diaconus, 88; von Lingenthal-Zepos, *Ius Graecoromanum*. Athens, 1931, 1, 247; Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdanides...*, 822; J. Laurent, *Byzance et les Turcs Seldjocides dans l'Asie occidentale jusqu'en 1081*. Nancy, 1913, 52, Note 1.

---

[35]

110 Tabari, tr. Canard, *Extraits des Sources Arabes*, 6; Euty chius, *Ibid.*, 25; Mas'udi, *Ibid.*, 38, 395; Hamza al-Isfahani, *Ibid.*, 47; Ibn al-Atir, *Ibid.*, 139; Sib t Ibn al-Gauzi. *Ibid.*, 165.

111 See for instance, A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire, 324-1453*, 2nd ed. Madison, Wisconsin, 1952, 301.

112 For a thorough study of the origin and early career of Basil I; Adontz, *L'Age et l'origine de l'empereur Basile I*, *Byzantion* 8 (1933) 475-550; 9 (1934) 223-260.

113 Adontz, *La portée historique de l'oraison funèbre de Basile I par son fils Leon VI le Sage*, *Byzantion* 8 (1933) 508 ff.

---

[36]

114 Theophanes Continuatus, 419; Georgius Monachus, 91.

115 Grégoire, *Notules*, *Byzantion*, 8 (1933) 572 ff.

116 Georgius Monachus, 841; Symeon Magister, 690; Theodosius Melitenus, 178. Constantine Porphyrogenitus calls Romanus "a common, illiterate fellow" and not one among those who "have followed the Roman national customs from the beginning", *De Administrando Imperio*, ed. Moravcsik and Jenkins, 72 (Bonn, 88). See further Liudprand of Cremona, *Works*, tr. by E. A. Wright. New York. 1930, 119 ff.; 127.

117 On the reign of Romanus Lecapenus and the Lecapeni in general: S. Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign*. Cambridge, 1929.

118 Matthew of Edessa, *Chronique*, tr. from Armenian by E. Dulaurier (Bibliothèque historique Arménienne). Paris, 1858, 16, 374. Cf. Armenian version of Michael Syrus translated by V. Langlois, *Chronique de Michel le Grand*, Venice, 1868, 281; Leo Diaconus, *op. cit.*, 92.

119 Theophanes Continuatus, 277; Cedrenus, 2, 213. Cf. A. Vogt, *Basile Ie empereur de Byzance (867-886) et la civilisation byzantine à la fin du IXe siècle*. Paris, 1908, 153.

---

[37]

120 Leo Diaconus, 117; Cedrenus, 2, 384.

121 Leo Diaconus, 38, 99.

122 *Ibid.*, 127.

123 Georgina Buckler, *A Sixth Century Botaniates*, *Byzantion* 6 (1931) 409 f.

124 Attaliates, *Historia*. Bonn, 1853, 217 ff.

---

[38]

125 Grégoire, *La carrière du premier Nicéphore Phocas*, 250.

126 For details, *Ibid.*, 232-250.

127 Cedrenus, 2, 285 f.

128 *Ibid.*, 2, 285, 316, 327.

129 Cf. Adontz et Grégoire, *Nicéphore au col roide*, Byzantion 8 (1933) 208.

130 Cedrenus, 2: 351.

131 On all this see Adontz et Grégoire, *Nicéphore au col roide*, 205 ff.

---

[39]

132 Cedrenus, 2: 726; Attaliates, 229. Cf. Buckler, *op. cit.*, 407 ff.

133 Attaliates, 220 ff.

---

[40]

134 Theophanes Continuatus, 426.

135 *Ibid.*, 426 f. On the career of John Curcuas: Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus*, 135-150.

136 Theophanes Continuatus, 429, Georgius Monachus, 917.

137 Theophanes Continuatus, 428; Cedrenus, 2, 347-348, 405, 483.

138 Theophanes Continuatus, 401; Georgius Monachus, 893-894.

---

[41]

139 Cedrenus, 2, 343; Theophanes Continuatus, 443. Cf. Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus*, 64. On the confiscation of the properties of Romanus Musele: von Lingenthal-Zepos, 1, 266, Note 48.

140 Const. Porphy., *De Thematibus*, ed. Pertusi, 81.

141 On Samonas see R. Janin, "Un Arabe ministre à Byzance: Samonas," *Echos d'Orient* 36 (1935), 307-318. But more especially, R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Flight of Samonas," *Speculum*, 23 (1948), 217-235.

142 For a study of the Krenitae; Adontz, *Les Taronites en Arménie et a Byzance*, Byzantion, 10 (1935), 535-540.

---

[42]

143 Theophanes Continuatus, 358; Cedrenus, 2, 255.

144 Cedrenus, 2, 417.

145 For details of the revolt of Bardas Skleros: G. Schlumberger, *L'épopée byzantine*, 1. Paris, 1896, 354 ff.; 726 ff.

146 Cedrenus, 2, 392.

147 *Ibid.*, 2.: 483, 501; Michael Psellos, *Chronographie*, ed. E. Renauld. Paris, 1926-1928, 125, 142 = Constantine IX, ch. 15, ch. 50. Basil's daughter was married to Constantine IX before he had become emperor. Basil's granddaughter was the beautiful Sklerina who served Constantine IX as his mistress. Psellos, *Idem*.

148 Cedrenus, 2, 622.

149 Anna Comnena, 2, 155 (Bonn Edition); 3, 70 (Ed., B. Leib, Paris, 1945).

150 See Note 66.

---

[43]

151 *Vita Euthymii*, ed. C. de Boor. Berlin, 1888, 2; edited with an English translation, P. Karlin-Hayter, Byzantion, 25-27 (1955-1957) 10.

152 *Ibid.* 3, 24 (de Boor); 12, 52 (Karlin-Hayter).

153 Cedrenus, 2, 258; Symeon Magister, 703.

154 Leo Diaconus, 46 f.; 94.

155 See the sketch drawn of Basil by Psellos, ed. Renauld, 1, 3, 12.

156 Theophanes Continuatus, 305, 306, 307, 308.

157 *Ibid.*, 423; Georgius Monachus, 914.

158 Theophanes Continuatus, 382-383; Symeon Magister, 718-719; Georgius Monachus, 874-875. Cf. Adontz, *Les Taronites en Arménie et a Byzance*, Byzantion 9 (1934), 737.

---

[44]

159 Adontz, *Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance*. Byzantion 10 (1935) 532-534.

160 Cedrenus, 2: 280; Theophanes Continuatus, 383.

161 Cf. Adontz, *Les fonds historiques de l'épopée byzantine Digénis Akritas*. Byz. Zeitschr. 29 (1929-1930) 205 f.

162 See Note 85 for the pertinent references.

163 Mavrogordato, *op. cit.*, LIII.

164 Theoph. Continuatus, 358; Cedrenus, 2, 254. On this encounter with Symeon, Cf. S. Runciman, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*. London, 1930, 144 ff.

---

[45]

165 Cedrenus, 2, 280; Theoph. Continuatus, 383.

166 Theoph. Continuatus, 435, 436; Cedrenus, 2, 327.

167 Cedrenus, 2, 424, 427; *Nicephorus Bryennius Commentarii*, ed. A. Meineke, Bonn, 1836, 154, where a Basil Kourtikes is mentioned.

168 *Ibid.*, 365-367. Cf. Adontz, *Notes Arméno-byzantines*, Byzantion 10 (1935) 184; W. H. Buckler, *Two Gateway Inscriptions*, Byz. Zeitschr. 30 (1929-30) 647-648.

169 Nicephorus Bryennius, 117; Anna Comnena, *The Alexiad*, ed. B. Leib, 1. Paris, 1937, 131; 3. Paris, 1945, 200 ff. The Bourtzes family used the Armenian name of Bardas: Anna Comnena, *op. cit.*, 3, 200.

170 On this family, see Adontz, *Notes Arméno-byzantines*, Byzantion 10 (1935) 161-170.

---

[46]

171 *Ibid.*, 171-185.

172 Adontz, *Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance*, *Byzantion* 9 (1934) 715-738, 10 (1935) 531-551; 11 (1936) 21-42. Also, his *Observations sur la généalogie des Taronites*, *Byzantion* 14 (1939) 407-413.

173 Nicephorus Melissenos, according to the French translation of Bryennius by H. Grégoire, is said to have been related to the Bourtzes family on his father's side. This would indicate that the Melissenoi were also of Armenian origin: H. Grégoire, *Nicéphore Bryennios: Les quatre livres des histoires*. *Byzantion* 23 (1953-1954) 480. It should be pointed out, however, that the Bonn edition of Bryennius (p. 24) has Moptious; not Bourtzes.

174 Adontz, *Les Taronites à Byzance*. *Byzantion* 11 (1936) 30-42.

---

[47]

175 Paul Peeters, *Un Colophon géorgien de Thornik le moine*. *Anal. Boll.* 50 (1932) 370-371; A. Adontz, *Tornik le moine*. *Byzantion* 13 (1938) 143-164. But cf. M. Tarchnisvili, *Die Anfänge der schriftstellerischen Tätigkeit des hl. Euthymius und der Aufstand von Bardas Skleros*. *Oriens Christianus* 38 (1954) 117. See also R. P. Blake, *Some Byzantine Accounting Practices*. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 51 (1940) 14-16.

176 Adontz, *Notes Arméno-byzantines*. *Byzantion* 9 (1934) 377-382.

177 *Ibid.*, 367-371.

178 M. Gyóni, *L'oeuvre de Kekaumenos, sources de l'histoire romaine*, *Rev. d'Hist. Comparée, nouvelle série*, 3 (1945) 109-125. The relationship between Katakalon and the author Kekauraenos is not quite clear. See Gyóni's (*op. cit.*, 126-128) review of the question. Concerning the Armenian origin of the Kekaumenoi see further Paul Lemerle, *Prolégomènes à une édition critique et commentée des "Conseils et Récits" de Kekaumenos* (= Acad. Royale de Belgique. Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques, Mémoires, 56). Brussels, 1960, 20 ff.

---

[48]

179 On members of the family of Apocapes, Vryonis, *The will of a Provincial Magnate, Eustathius Boilas (1059)*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 11 (1957) 274 f. The most distinguished member of the family of Pacurianus was Gregory (d. 1086) who held very important positions and whose extensive properties are known in detail. Louis Petit, *Typikon de Grégoire Pacourianos pour le monastère de Pétritzos (Bachkovo) en Bulgarie, Biz. vrem.* 11 (Supplement 1) (1904). On the origins and career of Gregory: p. vi ff. Though he served the Byzantine empire and served it well, Pacurianus never forgot his Georgian-Armenian origins. The monastery of Petzitzos which he founded was to house only Georgian monks. Greeks were specifically forbidden to become members of it. *Ibid.*, 44.

---

[49]

180 Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches*, 155 ff.; R. Grousset, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, 529-535; Schlumberger, *L'épopée Byzantine*, 2. Paris, 1900, 159-165. But see Z. Avalichvili who denies that either Basil II or the pro-Byzantine faction in the entourage of David had anything to do with the death of David, *La succession du Guropalate David d'Ibérie, dynaste de Tao*. *Byzantion* 8 (1933) 190 ff.

181 Continuator of Thomas Ardzrouni, *Histoire des Ardzrouni*, tr. by M. Brosset, *Collection d'Historiens Arméniens*, 1. St. Petersburg, 1874, 248; Samuel of Ani, *Table Chronologique*, tr. by Brosset, *Collection...*, 2, 1876, 443; Cedrenus, 2: 464; Grousset, *op. cit.*, 553 ff.; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze...*, 168 ff.; Schlumberger, *Epopée...*, 2: 500 ff.

---

183 Matthew of Edessa, *op. cit.*, 78. Aristakes of Lastivert, *Histoire d'Arménie*, tr. by E. Prud'homme. Paris, 1864, 69-70; Continuator of Thomas Ardzrouni, *op. cit.*, 248; Cedrenus, 2, 559; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze...*, 175, n. 3; Grousset, *op. cit.*, 556 ff., 577 ff.

---

[50]

183 Aristakes of Lastivert, *op. cit.*, 67-68; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze...*, 175.

184 Matthew of Edessa, *op. cit.*, 126; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze...* 188, n. 6.

185 Vryonis, *The will of a Provincial Magnate...*, 264, 265. The existence of Greek dedicatory inscriptions in the regions to which this text refers does not alter meaningfully the ethnic situation which it indicates. Cf. Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 29 ff.

180 Cedrenus, 2, 464; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze...*, 173, n. 4.

187 Cedrenus, 2, 559; Matthew of Edessa, *op. cit.*, 78; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze...*, 175, n. 3.

188 Aristakes of Lastivert, *op. cit.*, 67-68; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze...*, 175.

189 Matthew of Edessa, *op. cit.*, 126; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze...*, 188, n. 6.

190 Cedrenus, 2, 464; Aristakes of Lastivert, *op. cit.*, 31, n. 4.

191 Cedrenus, 2, 559.

192 Aristakes of Lastivert, *op. cit.*, 67-68; Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze...*, 175.

---

[51]

193 Matthew of Edessa, *op. cit.*, 113.

194 *Ibid.*, 114.

195 Michael Tchamtchian, *History of Armenia* (In Armenian) 2. Venice, 1785, 903. I consulted Tchamtchian's work with the help of Professor Sirarpie der Nersessian.

196 M. Brosset in Lebeau-Saint-Martin, *Histoire du Bas-empire* 14. Paris, 1838, 211. Tournebize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de L'Arménie*, 124.

197 Continuator of Thomas Ardzrouni, *op. cit.*, 248.

198 For instance Matthew of Edessa, *op. cit.*, 182.

---

[52]

199 On the expansion of the Armenians: Attaliates, 96-97, 137; Cedrenus, 2, 626; Matthew of Edessa, *op. cit.*, 182; Michael Syrus, 3, 133, 173, 187, 198; St. Narses of Lampron in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Documents Arméniens* 1. Paris, 1869, 576.

200 On the religious tension between Greeks and Armenians see now: Speros Vryonis, *Byzantium: The Social Basis of Decline in the Eleventh Century*, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 2 (1959) 169 ff. It must be pointed out, however, that there were Armenians even in the eastern regions of the empire, the so-called Tzatoi, who accepted Orthodoxy as defined by Constantinople: *Ibid.*, p. 169, n. 21; I. Doens, *Nicon de la Montagne*



Noire, *Byzantion* 24 (1954) 134; P. Peeters, *Orient et Byzance. Le Tréfonds Oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine*. Brussels, 1950, 163.

201 At Mentzikert the Armenian contingents in the Byzantine army deserted the Byzantine cause: Michael Syrus, *op. cit.*, 3, 169; cf. Attaliates, 113.

202 Romanus IV Diogenes took special measures to protect his troops from the attacks of the Armenians; Attaliates, 135. On the friendly attitude of some Armenians toward the Turks see Irene Melikoff, *La geste de Melik Danismend. Etude critique du Danismendname. I. Introduction et Traduction* (= Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut français d'Archéologie d'Istanbul, X) (Paris, 1960), 90, 126 but especially 129.

---

[53]

203 Cf. J. Laurent, *Byzance et les Turcs Seldjucides dans l'Asie occidentale jusqu'en 1081*. Nancy, 1913, 38 ff.

204 On Philaretus: J. Laurent, *Byzance et Antioche sous le curopalate Philarète*, *Rev. des Et. Arméniennes* 9 (1929) 61-72.

205 J. Laurent, *Des Grecs aux Croisés. Etude sur l'histoire d'Edesse entre 1071 et 1098*, *Byzantion* 1 (1924) 367-449.

206 Honigmann, *Malatya*, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* 3 (1936) 195.

207 Sempad, *Chronique de royaume de la Petite Arménie*, tr. E. Dulaurier, *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Documents Arméniens* 1. Paris, 1869, 619.

---

[54]

208 Gregory the Priest, *Chronique*, tr. Dulaurier, *Ibid.*, 154. Also note 2 on the same page for other references to sources to the effect that the Armenians of Cilicia recognized the suzerainty of the empire. Cf. Sirarpie Der Nersessian, [The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia](#), in *A History of the Crusades*, volume II, *The Later Crusades 1184-1311*, edited by R. I. Wolff and H. W. Hazard (Philadelphia, 1962), 630-659.

209 The Turkish conquest of Asia Minor and the political decline of the empire by no means brought to an end the migration of Armenians into Greek-speaking lands. We know, for instance, that in 1414 eighty Armenian families from Trebizond, Sebasteia and the country around were permitted by the Venetians to settle in Crete. Freddy Thiriet, *La Romanie Vénétienne au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1959), 414 f; also Thiriet, *Régestes de délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*, II (Paris, 1959), 120, no. 1516.

210 P. Charanis, *On the Ethnic Composition of Byzantine Asia Minor in the Thirteenth Century*, Thessalonica, 1953, 142 ff. [see *Bibliography*].

211 Gregory the Priest, *op. cit.*, 152 f.

---

[55]

212 P. Charanis, *On the Ethnic Composition of Byzantine Asia Minor...*, 144.

213 Anna Comnena (*Bonn*) 2, 298 f.; Nicetas Choniates, *Historia*. Bonn, 1835, 527, 534; Geoffroi de Ville-Hardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, edited and translated into modern French by M. Natalis de Wailly. Paris, 1872, 239.

214 For Armenians in Constantinople: Michael Syrus, *op. cit.*, 3, 185, 186.

215 Fr. Miklosich et J. Müller, *Acta et Diplomata Graeca*, 3. Vienna, 1865, 89; cf. Charanis, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire under the First Palaeologi Speculum*, 22 (1947) 76 f.

216 C. Jireček, *Geschichte der Bulgaren*. Prague 1876, 222. The presence of Armenians in the region of Moglena at least during the reign of Manuel Comnenus (1143-1180) is known from the Vita of St. Hilarios, bishop of Moglena, which was composed in the fourteenth century by Euphemius, the Bulgarian patriarch of Trnovo. It is stated there that Hilarios launched a violent persecution against numerous heretics, Manichaeans, Bogomiles and Armenians: Jireček, review of G. Weigand's, *Vlacho-Meglen, Eine ethno-graphisch-philologische Untersuchung*, in *Archiv f. s1. Philol.* 15 (1893) 98.

217 In the region around Lake Prespa where Greece, Yugoslavia and Albania meet there are a number of Byzantine monuments with distinctly Armenian architectural features. As these monuments are of a local type, their Armenian architectural features can best be explained by assuming the establishment of Armenian settlements there. See *Bibliography* for St. M. Pelekanides, Thessalonike, 1960, 55 ff.

---

[56]

218 J. Laurent, *Les origines médiévales de la question Arménienne*, *Rev. des Et. Armeniennes* I (1920) 47.

219 *Ibid.*, 49.

220 Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus...*, p. 165, n. 2.

221 Matthew of Edessa, *op. cit.*, 152-154. For a poem of the ninth century expressing the hatred of the Greeks against the Armenians: Vryonis, *Byzantium: The Social Basis of Decline in the Eleventh Century*, 173.

222 F. Macler, *Erzeroum ou topographie de la haute Arménie*, *Journ. Asiatique*, 11th series, 13 (1919) 223. Macler quotes an Armenian writer of the seventeenth century who says in effect: The Armenians hated the Greeks, the Greeks hated the Armenians and so God sent the Turks.

---

# The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire

by Peter Charanis

## Bibliography

[59]

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### PRIMARY SOURCES: GREEK

- Anna Comnena. *Alexiad.* Ed. Schöpan. 2 vols. Bonn, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* (CSHB), 1878. Also: *Alexiade. Règne de l'empereur Alexis I Comnène 1081—1118.* Ed. Leib. 3 vols. Paris, 1937-45.
- Cedrenus, George. *Historiarum Compendium.* Ed. Bekker. 2 vols. Bonn, CSHB, 1838-39.
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus. *De Administrando Imperio.* Ed. Niebuhr. Bonn, CSHB, 1840. I. Ed. Moravcsik and trans. into English by R. J. H. Jenkins: Budapest, 1949. II. Commentary. Ed. Jenkins. London, 1962.
- . *De ceremoniis aulae byzantinae.* Ed. Reiske and Bekker. Bonn, CSHB, 1829-40.
- . *Constantino Porphyrogenito De Thematibus.* Ed. Pertusi. *Studi e Testi 160.* Vatican, 1952.
- Digenes Akrites* Ed. Mavrogordato. Oxford, 1956.
- Evagrius Scholasticus. *Ecclesiastical History.* Ed. Bidez and Parmentier. London, 1898. English translation in Theodoret and Evagrius *History of the Church.* (Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library). London, 1854.
- Genesius, Joseph. *Regna.* Ed. Lachmann. Bonn, CSHB, 1834.
- Georgius Monachus. *Chronicon.* Ed. de Boor. Leipzig, 1904. Also: ed. Muralt. St. Petersburg, 1859.
- Leo Diaconus. *Historia.* Ed. Hase. Bonn, CSHB, 1828.
- Michael Attaliates. *Historia.* Ed. Bekker. Bonn, CSHB, 1855.
- Michael Psellos. *Chronographia.* Ed. and trans. Renaud. Paris, 1926-28. English trans. by E. R. A. Sewter: *The Chronographia of Michael Psellos.* London, 1953.
- Miklosich, Fr. and Müller, J. *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana.* 6 vols. Vienna, 1860-90.
- Nicephorus Bryennius *Commentarii.* Ed. Meineke. Bonn, CSHB, 1836. Trans. into French by H. Grégoire, *Byzantion* 23 (1953), 469-550; 25-27 (1955-57), 881-926.
- Nicephorus Patriarchus. *Opuscula Historica.* Ed. de Boor. Leipzig, 1880.
- Nicephorus Phocas. *De velitatione bellica.* Ed. Hase. Bonn, CSHB, 1828.
- Nicetas Choniates. *Historia.* Ed. Bekker. Bonn, CSHB, 1835.
- Petit, L., ed. «Typikon de Grégoire Pacourianos pour le monastère de Pétrizos (Bačkovovo) en Bulgarie», *Vizantiiskii Vremennik* 11 (Supplement 1), 1904.
- Photius, *The Homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople.* Engl. trans. by C. Mango. Cambridge, 1858.
- Procopius of Caesarea. *Opera Omnia.* Ed. Haury. Trans. into English by H. B. Dewing. 7 vols. (Loeb Classical Library). London, 1914-1940.
- Symeon Magister (Logothete). *Chronicle.* Ed. Bekker. Bonn, CSHB, 1838.
- Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo.* Trans. by H. L. Jones. 8 vols. (Loeb Classical Library). London, 1931-1949.
- Theodosius Melitenus. *Chronographia.* Ed. Tafel. Munich, 1859.
- Theophanes. *Chronographia.* Ed. de Boor. Leipzig, 1863.
- Theophanes Continuatus. *Historia.* Ed. Niebuhr. Bonn, CSHB, 1838.
- Theophylactus Simocatta. *Historia.* Ed. de Boor. Leipzig, 1887.

- Vita Euthemii*. Ed. de Boor. Berlin, 1888. Also: Ed. with an English translation by P. Karlin-Hayter, *Byzantion* 25-27 (1955-57): 1-172.
- Vryonis, S. «The Will of a Provincial Magnate, Eustathius Boilas», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 11 (1957): 263-277.
- Zachariae von Lingenthal-Zepos, J. and P. *Jus Graecoromanum*. 8 vols. Athens, 1930-31.

## PRIMARY SOURCES: ARMENIAN

- Aristakes of Lastivert. *Histoire d'Arménie*. Trans. by E. Prud'homme. Paris, 1864.
- Continuator of Thomas Ardzrouni. *Histoire des Ardzrouni*. Trans. by M. Brosset. *Collection d'Historiens Arméniens* 1: 1-266. St. Petersburg, 1874.
- Ghevond, *Histoire des guerres et des conquêtes des Arabes en Arménie*. Trans. from Armenian by C. V. Chahnazarian. Paris, 1856.
- Gregory the Priest. *Chronique*. Trans. by E. Dulaurier. *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Documents Arméniens* 1: 152-201. Paris, 1869.
- St. Narses of Lampron. In: *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Documents Arméniens* 1: 551-605. Paris, 1869.
- Samuel of Ani. *Tables Chronologiques*. Trans. by M. Brosset. *Collection d'Historiens Arméniens* 2: St. Petersburg, 1874.
- Sebeos. *Histoire d'Heraclius*. Trans. by F. Macler. Paris, 1904.
- Sempad. *Chronique de royaume de la Petite Arménie*. Trans. by E. Dulaurier. *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Documents Arméniens* 1: 605-680. Paris, 1869.
- Stephen (Asoghik) of Taron. *Histoire universelle* (1<sup>re</sup> partie). Trans. by E. Dulaurier. (*Publications de l'Ecole des Langues Orientales Vivantes XVIII*). Paris, 1883.
- Matthew of Edessa. *Chronique*. Trans. by E. Dulaurier. (*Bibliothèque historique Arménienne*). Paris, 1858-59.
- Muyldermans, J. *La domination arabe en Arménie*. Paris, 1927.

## PRIMARY SOURCES: ARABIC

- Agapius (Mahboub) cf Menbidj. *Histoire universelle*. Trans. by A. A. Vasiliev. *Patrologia Orientalis* 8 (1912): 399-550.
- Dahibi. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes* (Vol. II, part 2 of Vasiliev's *Byzance et les Arabes*). Trans. by M. Canard. Brussels, 1950: 236-244.
- Eutychius. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 24-27.
- Hamza al-Isfahānī. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 46-47.
- Ibn al-Aṭf. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 129-162.
- Ibn Hauqal. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 409-421.
- Ibn Zāfir. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 118-128.
- Kodāma. In: *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum* 6. Ed. de Goeje. Lugduni-Batavorum, 1889.
- Mas 'ūdi. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 31-43.
- Mutanabbi. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 304-348.
- Sibt Ibn al-Ḡauzī. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 163-176.
- Tabari. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 4-23.
- Yahyā Ibn Sa'īd. In: *Extraits des Sources Arabes*: 80-98.

## PRIMARY SOURCES: SYRIAC

- Bar Hebraeus. *The Chronography of Gregory Abul Faraj*. Trans. by E. A. W. Budge. Oxford, 1932.
- Dionysius I of Tell-Mahré. *Chronique*. Trans. by J.-B. Chabot. (*Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Études*, fasc. 112). Paris, 1895.
- John of Ephesus. *Iohannis Ephesini historiae ecclesasticae pars tertia*. Ed. Brooks. CSCO. Louvain, 1936. Also: *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History*. Trans. by R. P. Smith. Oxford, 1860.

- Michael Syrus. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite de Antioche (1166-1199)*. Ed. and trans. by J.-B. Chabot. 4 vols. Paris, 1899-1910. Also: *Chronique de Michel le Grand*. Trans. from the Armenian version by V. Langlois. Venice, 1868.

## PRIMARY SOURCES: OTHER

- Geoffroi de Ville-Hardouin. *La Conquête de Constantinople*. Ed. and trans. into modern French by M. Natalis de Wailly. Paris, 1872.  
John of Nikiu. *Chronique*. Ed. and trans. by H. Zotenberg. Paris, 1883. Also: *Chronicle*. Trans. by H. Charles. London, 1916.  
Liudprand of Cremona. *Works*. Trans. by E. A. Wright. New York, 1930.  
Mélikoff, Irène. *La geste de Melik Dänishmend. Etude critique du Danishmendname*. I. *Introduction et traduction* (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut français d'Archéologie d'Istanbul, X). Paris, 1960.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Adontz, N. *Armenia v Epochu Iustiniana: Politicheskoe Sostoianie Na Ostav' Nakhararskago Stroia* (Armenia in the Epoch of Justinian: The Political Structure on the Basis of the Nakharar Class). St. Petersburg, 1908.  
Bury, J. B. *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire, From the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (802-87)*. London, 1912.  
———. *A History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian (395-565)*. Second ed. 2 vols. London, 1923.  
Canard, M. *Histoire de la dynastie des H'andaniides de Jarfa et de Syrie*. Paris, 1953.  
Dölger, F. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*. 3 vols. Munich, 1924-32.  
Gelzer, H. *Die Genesis der byzantinischen Themenverfassung*. Leipzig, 1899.  
Goubert, P. *Byzance avant l'Islam*. 1. *Byzance et l'Orient sous les successeurs de Justinien. L'Empereur Maurice*. Paris, 1951.  
Grousset, R. *Histoire de l'Arménie des origines à 1071*. Paris, 1947.  
Hirsch, F. *Byzantinische Studien*. Leipzig, 1876.  
Honigsmann, E. *Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071 nach griechischen, arabischen, syrischen und armenischen Quellen*. Brussels, 1935.  
Jireček, C. *Geschichte der Bulgaren*. Prague, 1877.  
Karayannopoulos, J. *Die Entstehung der byzantinischen Themenordnung*. Munich, 1959.  
Laurent, J. *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam depuis la conquête arabe jusqu'en 856*. Paris, 1919.  
———. *Byzance et les Turcs Seldjucides dans l'Asie occidentale jusqu'en 1081*. Nancy, 1913.  
Lebeau, C. *Histoire du Bas-Empire*. Ed. Saint-Martin and Brosset. 21 vols. Paris, 1824-36.  
Lombard, A. *Etudes d'histoire byzantine. Constantin V, empereur des Romains (740-775)*. Paris, 1902.  
Ostrogorsky, G. *History of the Byzantine State*. New Brunswick, N. J., 1957.  
Peeters, P. *Acta Sanctorum, Novembris, Tomus Quartus*. Brussels, 1925.  
———. *Orient et Byzance. Le Tréfond Oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine*. Brussels, 1950.  
Runciman, S. *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign*. Cambridge, 1929.  
———. *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*. London, 1930.  
———. *The Medieval Manichee*. Cambridge, 1947.  
Schlumberger, G. *L'épopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle*. 3 vols. Paris, 1896-1905.  
———. *Un empereur byzantin au dixième siècle: Nicéphore Phocas*. Paris, 1890.  
Tchamtschian, M. *History of Armenia*. (In Armenian). 3 vols. Venice, 1784-1786.  
Thiriet, F. *La Romanie Vénétienne au Moyen Age*. Paris, 1959.  
———. *Régestes de délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie*. 2 vols. Paris, 1959.  
Tournebise, Fr. *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie, depuis les origines des Arméniens jusqu'à la mort de leur dernier roi (l'an 1303)*. Paris, 1900.  
Vasiliev, A. A. *History of the Byzantine Empire*. Second ed. Madison, Wisc., 1952.  
——— and Grégoire, H. *Byzance et les Arabes*. 2 vols. Brussels, 1935.  
Vogt, A. *Basile le empereur de Byzance (867-886) et la civilisation byzantine à la fin du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris, 1908.

## SECONDARY SOURCES: PERIODICAL

- Adontz, N. «L'Age et l'origine de l'empereur Basile I», *Byzantion* 8 (1933): 475-500; *Byzantion* 9 (1934): 223-260.
- «Les fonds historiques de l'épopée byzantine Digénis Akritas», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 29 (1929-30): 198-227.
- «Notes Arméno-Byzantines», *Byzantion* 9 (1934): 367-382, 10 (1935): 161-203.
- «Observations sur la généalogie des Taronites», *Byzantion* 14 (1939): 407-413.
- «Les légendes de Maurice et de Constantin V, empereurs de Byzance», (*Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales* 2); Brussels, 1934.
- «La portée historique de l'oraison funèbre de Basile I par son fils Léon VI le Sage», *Byzantion* 8 (1933): 501-513.
- «Role of the Armenians in Byzantine Sciences», *Armenian Review*, vol. 3, no. 3 (1950): 55-75.
- «Samuel l'Arménien, roi des Bulgares», (*Mémoires de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres* 38); Brussels, 1938.
- «Sur l'origine de Léon V, empereur de Byzance», *Armeniaca* 2 (1927): 1-10.
- «Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance», *Byzantion* 9 (1934): 715-738; 10 (1935): 531-551; 11 (1936): 21-42.
- «Tornik le moine», *Byzantion* 13 (1938): 143-164.
- and Grégoire, H. «Nicéphore au Col roide», *Byzantion* 8 (1933): 205-212.
- Anderson, J. G. C. «The Campaign of Basil I Against the Paulicians in 872 A. D.», *The Classical Review* 10 (1896): 136-139.
- «The Road System of Eastern Asia Minor with the Evidence of Byzantine Campaigns», *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 17 (1897): 22-44.
- Avalichvili, Z. «La succession du Curopalate David d'Ibérie, dynaste de Tao», *Byzantion* 8 (1933): 177-202.
- Blake, R. P. «Some Byzantine Accounting Practices», *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 51 (1940): 14-18.
- Brooks, E. W. «Arabic Lists of the Byzantine Themes», *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 21 (1901): 67-77.
- Buckler, Georgina. «A Sixth Century Botaniates», *Byzantion* 6 (1931): 405-410.
- Buckler, W. H. «Two Gateway Inscriptions», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 30 (1929-1930): 646-648.
- Charanis, P. «The Chronicle of Monemvasia and the Question of the Slavonic Settlements in Greece», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 5 (1950): 139-167.
- «Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 13 (1959): 25-44.
- «The Jews in the Byzantine Empire under the First Palaeologi», *Speculum* 22 (1947): 75-77.
- «On the Ethnic Composition of Byzantine Asia Minor in the Thirteenth Century», (*Προσφορά εις Σπλιτων π. Κυριαζιδης*), Thessalonika, 1953.
- Cumont, F. «L'Annexion du pont polémoniaque et de la Petite Arménie», *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, Manchester, 1923.
- De Boor, C. «Zu Genesisos», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 10 (1901): 62-65.
- Der Nersessian, S. «The Kingdom of Cilician Armenia», in *A History of the Crusades*, vol. II, *The Later Crusades 1184-1311*. Ed. by Wolff and Hazard. Philadelphia, 1962.
- Doens, I. «Nicon de la Montagne Noire», *Byzantion* 24 (1964): 131-140.
- Dvornik, F. «The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 7 (1953): 67-97.
- Gelzer, H. «Pergamon unter Byzantinern und Osmanen», (*Abhandlungen des Königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften von Jahre 1908*); Berlin, 1903.
- «Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae Episcopatum», (*Königlich Akademie der Wissenschaften, München, Philologisch-Historische Abteilung, Abhandlungen* 51); Munich, 1901.
- Grégoire, H. «An Armenian Dynasty on the Byzantine Throne», *Armenian Quarterly* 1 (1946): 4-21.
- «Les Arméniens entre Byzance et l'Islam», *Byzantion* 10 (1935): 665-667.
- «La carrière du premier Nicéphore Phocas», (*Προσφορά εις Σπλιτων π. Κυριαζιδης*); Thessalonika, 1953.

- «Études sur le neuvième siècle», *Byzantion* 8 (1933): 515-550.
- «Manuel et Théophobe ou la concurrence de deux monastères», *Byzantion* 9 (1934): 183-204.
- «Notes épigraphiques», *Byzantion* 8 (1933): 49-88.
- «Notules», *Byzantion* 8 (1933): 569-574.
- «Précisions géographiques et chronologiques sur les Pauliciens», (*Académie royale de Belgique: Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, 5 ser.); Brussels, 1947.
- Gyoni, M. «L'oeuvre de Kekaumenos. sources de l'histoire romaine», *Revue d'Histoire Comparée (nouvelle série)* 3 (1945): 109-125.
- Honigsmann, E. Article: «Malatya», in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* 3 (1936 ed.): 192-197.
- «Trois mémoires posthumes d'histoire et de géographie de l'orient chrétien», (*Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe des Lettres et de Sciences Morales et Politiques. Mémoire. Tome LIV*); Brussels, 1961.
- Janin, R. «Un Arabe ministre à Byzance: Samonas», *Echos d'Orient* 36 (1935): 307-318.
- Jenkins, R. J. H. «The Flight of Samonas», *Speculum* 23 (1948): 217-235.
- Jenkins, R. J. H., Laourdas, B., Mango, C. A. «Nine Orations of Arethas from Cod. Marc. Gr. 524», *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 47 (1954): 1-40.
- Jireček, C. Review of G. Weigand's *Vlacho-Meglen, Eine ethnographisch-philologische Untersuchung*, in *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 15 (1893): 98.
- Kyriakides, P. «Τὸ Μολυβδοβόλον τοῦ Στρατηγοῦ Μελίου», *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*, Thessalonika, 1932.
- Laurent, J. «Byzance et Antioche sous le curopalate Philarète», *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* 9 (1929): 61-72.
- «Des Grecs aux Croisés. Etude sur l'histoire d'Edesse entre 1071 et 1098», *Byzantion* 1 (1924): 367-449.
- «Les origines médiévales de la question Arménienne», *Revue des Etudes Arméniennes* 1 (1920): 35-54.
- Lemerle, P. «Prolégomènes à une édition critique et commentée des «Conseils et Récits» de Kekaumenos», (*Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques, Mémoires* 56); Brussels, 1960.
- Macler, F. «Erzeroum ou topographie de la haute Arménie», *Journal Asiatique* (11<sup>e</sup> serie) 15 (1919): 153-237.
- Ostrogorsky, G. «Korreferat zu A. Pertusi 'La Formation des thèmes byzantins'», *Berichte zum XI internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongress*. Munich, 1958: I, 1-8.
- Peeters, P. «Un Colophon Géorgien de Thornik le moine», *Analecta Bollendiana* 50 (1932): 358-371.
- Pelekanides, St. M. *Βυζαντινὰ καὶ Μεταβυζαντινὰ Μνημεῖα τῆς Πρωτοῦς*, Thessalonika, 1960.
- Pertusi, A. «La Formation des thèmes byzantins», *Berichte zum XI internationalen Byzantinisten-Kongress*. Munich, 1958: I, 1-40.
- Tarchnisvili, M. «Die Anfänge der schriftstellerischen Tätigkeit der hl. Euthymius und der Aufstand von Bardas Skleros», *Oriens Christianus* 38 (1954): 113-124.
- Vasiliev, A. A. «Harun-Ibn Yahya and His Description of Constantinople», *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 5 (1932): 149-163.
- Vryonis, S. «Byzantium: The Social Basis of Decline in the Eleventh Century», *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 2 no. 2 (1959): 157-175.